

TC 625
.C5 D3
Copy 1

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chas. TC 625

Shelf. C5 D3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.



Editor of the National Intelligencer

DELTA:

OR

WHAT OUGHT THE STATE TO DO

WITH THE

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL?

~ 1841



TCK 25
C 573

6-7305

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER.

THE following collection has been made of letters published at various times in the public news of the city of Baltimore and elsewhere, on the subject of the Canal, in order to present connectedly the different opinions which have been held by several writers with regard to the matter; and thus to countervail what by the Editor are conceived to be erroneous and impolitic impressions.

All possible fairness has been exercised towards the writers against the propriety of continuing the work, by allowing them to give their remarks in full. And if their remarks have not covered the whole of the subject, or there should be weightier objections unurged yet behind, it is not the fault of the Editor. All the communications adverse to the main question which came to his knowledge, have been collected; except those which being in one or another manner published over the citizen names of individuals, seemed to indicate the propriety of recognizing a sort of *copy-right*, with which the Editor does not care to meddle.

The acknowledged public interest in the subject will, it is presumed, secure to this collection numerous readers; who will hardly fail to acknowledge one feature of the validity of a cause in the willingness of the advocates of that cause to allow their adversaries full hearing.

That its other, intrinsic, and higher merits may be duly appreciated in the public action about to take place in its behalf, is the profound desire of

THE EDITOR.

BALTIMORE, 24 March, 1841.

LETTERS OF DELTA AND OTHERS
ON THE
CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

PAYING FOR A DEAD HORSE.

A PROPOSITION is before the Legislature to advance another million of dollars to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company.

There is a proposition also to raise the sum of six hundred thousand dollars by taxation to pay the interest on the State Debt.

It is an undeniable fact, that the necessity for this tax has grown out of the enormous expenditure lavished on the Canal. But for these expenditures, the resources of the State would have been amply sufficient to pay the interest on her debt without resort to taxation.

It is equally undeniable that *the Canal is not a Maryland work*, so far as its results are to be beneficial to the general interests of *the whole State*.

The Canal is a work beneficial to Alleghany, Washington, Frederick, and Montgomery counties, and to the cities of the District of Columbia.

The question then is, shall sixty thousand dollars more be added to the annual tax proposed to be laid upon the whole people of Maryland, in all her twenty counties, for the benefit of four of these counties and three foreign and rival cities.

As a general principle it may be admitted, that it is expedient to hazard money, at times, to recover a desperate debt, and it may therefore be urged, that although Maryland ought never to have begun the Canal, yet that, now, she has no alternative but to finish it, to save herself from the loss of every thing that she has heretofore expended. *But will the million now asked for finish the Canal?* No, CERTAINLY NOT.

The Canal Company is now in debt half a million, it is said;—so that there would be but half a million to apply to the prosecution of the work, unless indeed the present creditors of the Canal Company, who are the most clamorous for the passage of the appropriation law, would postpone their claims to a more convenient season—which is not probable.

But the whole million, if applied to payments for new work, will not finish the Canal to Cumberland, or any thing like it. In the message of Governor Grason, of 1839, he stated that three millions would be required to complete the work.

To what conclusion are we then driven. Why, that the present application is to pay off present debts, and keep the Canal dawdling along until another session of the Legislature affords another chance of getting something more.

And what is the character of the present debts. Nearly all of them have been incurred to persons who well knew the risks they run of ultimate payment. Many of them are debts to those who have taken Canal scrip at a depreciation, and whose profits, when the Legislature pay off all scores at par, will be enormous. They are not debts due to persons who believed, at the time, there would

be no difficulty in getting their money, but to persons who knew the difficulties well, and who took the chances—and who demanded corresponding premiums.

That there are exceptions, we are willing to believe—but there cannot be a doubt that all the debts of twelve months past were incurred with full notice to both parties of the difficulty in the way of payment.

Under these circumstances are the people of Maryland willing to increase the tax, that honour and good faith require them now to lay, by another sixty thousand dollars, the principal of which, when spent, will still find them far from the accomplishment of the object for which they will have submitted to the burden. This would truly be paying for a dead horse.

A TAX-PAYER.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

THE people of Baltimore have seen with no less surprise than regret, an effort made in the Legislature of Maryland, to issue \$1,600,000 of State bonds, for the purpose of giving \$1,000,000 to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, and to raise \$600,000 for the purpose of meeting the interest to be paid by the State of Maryland during the present year. If such a plan as this be adopted, the result will be of the most unfavourable character to the credit of the State, and the inevitable effect will be to depreciate to an enormous extent the State scrip. The people of Baltimore feel that they must be heavily taxed to meet their share of the interest on \$7,000,000 already contracted, in the effort to finish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. To this we must submit, and we will cheerfully do so; but if an additional heavy debt should be attempted to be incurred, it will be then high time for us to take a decided stand, and by our united voices to declare that such a course would be pregnant with ruin. The stock of the State has already greatly depreciated, and doubtless, under any circumstances, will continue to be less and less valuable for some time to come.

At a sale which lately took place in Baltimore, State 5 per cent. bonds were sold at 74 per cent. on the \$100, and it is now perfectly well known that the City stock is preferred to the State stock. The cause of this is obvious. The City lays a direct tax to meet the interest on its engagements. The State has heretofore refused to pursue the same manly and honest cause. The City will incur no further liabilities as a corporation. This is now agreed upon as its settled policy. The Legislature of our State has not yet defined its policy.

If a direct tax be at once laid sufficient to meet the interest on the State debt, and all intention of involving the State still more be for the present *abandoned*, we may hope for better times. The fate of the Pennsylvania Bank of the United States ought to be held up as a warning to deter our public authorities from contracting further debts. The people of Baltimore have a deep interest in these matters, and their voices ought to be raised in reprobation of any attempt to add to burthens already almost beyond endurance.

BALTIMORE.

DELTA, I.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

In the American of the 10th of February, the subject of this work was touched upon in two communications; and as it seems to have been regarded from one side only, I propose in what follows to examine if it cannot be looked at from another and more commanding point of view. The importance of the subject intrinsically, and as connected both with the finances and the legislation of the State, will be a sufficient reason for my trouble, and for its attentive consideration by the public.

By way of presenting the matter in the same connection in which the present communication originates, I propose first, with entire respect for the opinions of

the writers of the articles referred to, to make some comments upon the views in those articles, and afterwards to exhibit the real relations of the subject in one condensed general statement.

The view of the writer who signs himself 'Baltimore,' seems to be this:— That it is better to make abandonment of the \$7,500,000 already expended on the Canal, than by any farther outlays to run the risk of increasing the difficulties in the fiscal affairs of the State. Is not this virtually to affirm that it is better to assume the payment of an annuity of \$425,000 for an indefinite period, rather than by an immediate investment, of say \$2,500,000, to purchase the reasonable probability of receiving an annuity of \$600,000? Those who are familiar with the reports and legislation on the subject of the Canal, will see at once how these sums are derived.

In fact, as the \$425,000 will have to be paid for two years in any case, the question may be as fairly stated thus: *Is it good or bad policy for the State, or any one dealing in money, to purchase by a premium of \$150,000 for two years, a reasonably secured perpetual annuity of \$600,000?* Those who are accustomed to make calculations of insurance, can answer this question readily.

This is the ultimate condition of the question. The arguments of 'Baltimore,' being directed only against one instalment, (\$1,000,000 of the \$2,500,000 required) are of course included still more definitely by the answer to the proposition here advanced.

One accessory argument which he uses, viz: the present low price of the State stock, seems to have been already appreciated by the Legislature. It is presumed that for this very reason an advance of \$1,000,000 (enough for a year's work) is proposed, instead of the whole sum required, \$2,500,000.

I will notice only one point more in this article, mainly because it gives me an opportunity of expressing my accordance with the writer, in the propriety of a direct State tax to meet the interest on the public debt. There is, however, a slight *inconclusiveness* in his treatment of this matter. He says, that 'under any circumstances, the State stocks will continue to be less and less valuable for some time to come.' And yet the first reason given for a preference now manifested for City stock over State stock, is that the City lays a direct tax for payment of interest. An event as probable as any other not yet taken place, is that the State will this winter impose a similar tax. By parity of reasoning, will not this event constitute a circumstance to cause an appreciation of the State stock?

These details do not appear to me of any moment to the main subject: but yet I will only remark as somewhat inconsistent with the 'well known' preference of City stocks over State stocks to which the writer adverts, that in the same number of the American in which his communication appears, the City and State 6 per cents. *are quoted at the same price*; and while City 5 per cents. are quoted at 82, State 5 per cent. stock, (of the kind that may be expected to be issued in future,) is quoted at 85. I admit that the State 5 per cent. currency is at 78; but were I to furnish a reason for the depreciation, it would be that the City stock happens to be sought after as the only means of getting rid of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road notes, which are fundable specially in this stock.

The writer of the other article, who signs himself 'A Tax-payer,' states as the first of his premises, that 'the necessity for this tax has grown out of the enormous expenditure lavished on the Canal.' If he means the whole tax, the proposition is not quite as accurate as might be desirable for drawing conclusions on a grave subject. The Canal is responsible at most only for 425,000 dollars of the 600,000: and a part of this is for interest which has been converted into capital.

Perhaps the whole fact (thus qualified) as advanced by the writer, might be met by another equally undeniable, viz: that people cannot expect to enjoy the bene-

fits of any bargain or operation without paying for it. The investments of the State in the Canal, were not made to get rid of plethoric resources, but *as a money-making scheme*: on the results of which she expected to make profit above the interest she had to pay on borrowed capital. It would be doing injustice to the eminent men, upon whose calculations and estimates this expectation was originally founded, to dismiss them summarily as the abettors of a wild and groundless scheme; and it is upon this ground that I have thought myself allowed in a preceding paragraph to characterize the future income of the Canal when finished, as a '*reasonably secured* perpetual annuity.' In this regard, full light has been shed upon the subject in the recent report of the geologist: to which all who are desirous of further information may be safely referred. I am not sure, either, that it is not also doing injustice to the successors of those eminent men to term the expenditure on the Canal enormous and lavish. The original estimate of BERNARD, (than whom America has never seen a more skilful engineer,) was upwards of 8,000,000 to Cumberland—the actual cost when finished will not exceed 12,000,000. The difference of prices (in more things than day-labour) between 1825 and 1840, does not warrant this difference (of less than 50 per cent.) in being called *enormous*. In fact the State gets all the benefit of it for 10,000,000, supposing that she completes it; and it is farther to be borne in mind that a part of this *ten millions is not expenditure in construction, but for interest.*

The next position of the Tax-payer is, that the Canal is not a Maryland work: but as there is no accompanying definition of what should constitute a Maryland, or I suppose a State work, it is not so easy for every one at once to accord in these premises.

It is to be presumed that any work which contributes an income to the State treasury, *is a State work*. That the Canal will do so, is a matter of great probability—at least, it is not to be affirmed that it will not, until it is completed to the coal region. Had the Washington Branch Rail Road been suspended at Beltsville, it is very likely it would be now in the same predicament as the Canal; and in this light, not a State or public work. But it is to be presumed that the Tax-payer grants this, inasmuch as he refers to future results 'which are not to be beneficial to the general interests of the whole State.' If the payment of an income to the State is not a beneficial result to general interests, it would be difficult to select any thing to which the term *beneficial* could be applied.

Passing by this, however, as concerning characters not yet actual, let us inquire what other conditions are necessary to entitle any work of intercommunication to be called a State work. If a continuous and extended transit through the territory of a State is such a condition, then the Canal is a State work *par excellence*. One-half, or more, of the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road, even as far as Cumberland, lies in Virginia. If that road is completed to the west, nearly the whole remaining portion will lie in Pennsylvania: so that more than seven millions of the money of the State and of the city of Baltimore will have been expended to make a road, *one-half of which is in Pennsylvania, and one-fourth in Virginia*. Nevertheless, the title of a Maryland work has always been claimed (and for aught that I have to say, justly too,) for that road.

Further, by parity of reasoning, in the same manner that the Canal is beneficial to Allegany, Washington, and the other counties enumerated in the article, with which the State has some concern, the rail road is beneficial to the counties of Jefferson, Berkley and Morgan, in Virginia, with which the State has nothing to do. If, therefore, the Canal is to be excluded from the name even of a Maryland work, we must look for some other characteristic as the Shibboleth.

If to create, as it were, new articles of commerce and of daily necessity, whereby the citizens of the State can have several most important wants supplied

by products of their own territory without importation, and can farther pay for other articles of import, not in specie, but in kind—if this be a test to discover that ingredient in any of our public works from which any of said works draw a just title to be called Maryland works, then the Canal is again a Maryland work, *par eminence*. Make the Canal, and you make a trade in coal which never existed before. The city of Baltimore expends annually hardly less than 350,000 dollars for anthracite coal from Pennsylvania, for which she pays in money. If the Canal is made, all that will be paid to her own western fellow-citizens in the groceries and flour of her market: and fuel will be, moreover, from fifteen to twenty per cent. cheaper.

What other Maryland work, it may be asked, has this characteristic, in any degree. Except the granite, a resource developed by the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road, there is none that has opened any domestic, manufactured or commercial article. The Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road is intended for the conveyance of the trade of Ohio, of Pennsylvania, and of Virginia. It brings down the flour of Frederick and Washington, but the trade in that article existed before. According to a view of a 'Tax-payer,' however, this very circumstance takes away, in part, from that work its claim to be considered a Maryland work; unless indeed its coming to the city of Baltimore be the redeeming feature in its title. The Baltimore and Susquehanna Rail Road is for the domestic industry of the central valley of the Susquehanna, and of the citizens of Pennsylvania. The Baltimore and Port Deposite Road is, I believe, a private corporation: but the Tide Water Canal, of which the State is a stockholder, is essentially of the same character as the Baltimore and Susquehanna Rail Road, with this difference, that the Philadelphians claim it as being in their own power to make it as beneficial to their city as it can be to Baltimore.

By all the characteristics which have been mentioned, therefore, the Canal is, of all our works of intercommunication, the most entitled to be considered a Maryland work.

With this primary defect in the premises, the conclusions based upon them run great chance of falling to the ground along with the '*dead horse*' upon which they have been mounted.

HAVING PAID IN PART FOR A DEAD HORSE—HOW TO MAKE THE MOST OF THE BARGAIN.

We yesterday asserted that the million now asked for by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, at the hands of the Legislature, was wholly inadequate to complete the work to Cumberland, but would be consumed in payment of debts contracted to persons, to whom, generally, little if any consideration was due by the State, since they became creditors knowing the difficulties in the way of payment;—and we put the question, whether the people of the whole twenty counties of Maryland were willing to add 60,000 dollars to the heavy tax about to be laid on them, for the benefit of four counties only, three foreign and rival cities, and a set of creditors who had, in becoming such, taken all the chances of payment, at the time, into consideration. To this question the people of Maryland can give but one answer. Let their representatives look well to it, before they run counter to their will.

Let us glance a little at the past.

When General Bernard estimated the Canal from Georgetown to Cumberland at \$8,177,081 05, it was held to be as impracticable as it would be unprofitable.

A Canal Convention theorized the cost down to \$3,250,000; and there were found two civil engineers, Geddes and Roberts, who corroborated this reduction by stating that this work could be done for \$3,563,907 82. The scheme, thus

guessed into shape again, received the subscription of \$1,000,000 from Congress, which gave it vitality. This subscription was reported to be based on confidence in Geddes and Roberts. [See report of Canal Co. to the Legislature, January 31st, 1831.]

The people believed it preposterous to undertake the work if it was to cost \$8,177,081 05—but reasonable to construct it, if it could be done for \$3,500,000.

Now what has it cost?

May 26, 1828, Congress subscribed	\$1,000,000
Maryland 1st subscription,	500,000
City of Washington,	1,000,000
City of Georgetown,	250,000
City of Alexandria,	250,000
Individuals, about	500,000
Maryland 2d subscription,	125,000
Maryland 3d subscription,	2,000,000
Maryland 4th subscription,	3,000,000
Maryland 5th subscription,	1,375,000

	10,000,000
Wanted to complete it, as stated by Gov. Grason in 1839, . .	3,000,000

	\$13,000,000

In October, 1826, Bernard's report killed the Canal project, by stating the cost to be \$8,177,081 05. It has already cost \$10,000,000; and there are found people who urge the State to plunge \$3,000,000 more into debt, to complete the work. What is there to justify completing the Canal for \$13,000,000 now, which did not exist in 1826, to justify undertaking it at a cost of \$8,177,081 05. Probable profits? Are the sources of these multiplied since 1826?—or, being wiser in our day and generation, do we appreciate these sources more truly now than was done then? Not at all—on the contrary, since Bernard's report the coal fields of Pennsylvania have been opened and made available; so that the Cumberland coal instead of having the market to itself, will have to fight its way into it against the vast and powerful interest that has now pre-occupied it. But we are in the scrape. We must spend more money to save what we have already expended. This is the argument that is used; and it is the only argument that can be used. It would be a better argument than it is likely to be however, if it were not addressed to a people on the eve of a heavy taxation, and to whom it appeals to induce them to assume a heavy burthen, in the mere hope of prospective benefits, to enure to foreign cities and to four counties only, and to creditors who became such with full notice.

For the present debt the tax must be laid, and the people of Maryland for their honor's sake will pay it. But they will assume nothing unnecessarily. The Canal is already finished to dam No. 6. This backs the water of the Potomac to within 40 miles of Cumberland. The rail road now being constructed without the cost of a penny of interest to the State runs along the edge of this dam, and can discharge all the coal that may be wanted for years, into Canal boats at that spot; and the Canal, so far as coal can make it profitable, will be made profitable in its present extent, without a dollar of further outlay.

What then is the course to be pursued? Is it not plain?—to use the rail road as a feeder to the Canal, and not to incur one cent more debt, at this time, in the prosecution of a work, which absorbs all the money that has been lavished on it, without producing returns, as the land of the desert absorbs the rains of heaven without affording one blade of grass as evidence of fertility. If the rail road, as

here suggested, is employed as a feeder to the Canal, so as to bring what is completed of the latter into profitable use, without further expenditure on account of it, we will, after paying for a dead horse, have made the most of our bargain out of it.

A TAX-PAYER.

DELTA, II.

RACING—BY A DEAD HORSE.

BEFORE giving what was intended as the second part of this communication, it may be as well to continue the course adopted in the former, and comment a little upon the second heat of the dead horse, under the Tax-Payer, in the American of 11th February.

The writer re-affirms his conclusions as to the benefits of the canal being confined 'to four counties, three foreign and rival cities, and a set of creditors' who he thinks have had premium-picking enough to justify their now paying the loss. After having exhibited the 'foundation' upon which those conclusions were settled, I agree with the Tax-Payer that the people of Maryland can and are likely 'to give but one answer.' Whether it will be the *one* answer he wishes for is quite another affair.

In the glances which he takes at the history of the past, the writer seems hardly more fortunate than when he was careering at conclusions for the future. To quote documents: the Board of Internal Improvement certainly did not consider the work as either impracticable or unprofitable. [See Doc. No. 10, 2d session 20th Congress, pages 66, 75.]

It is admitted, if it is desired, that the Canal, interest and construction, will cost 13 millions. There is very reasonable and sufficient proof that it will be worth, *in income*, more; and if the indirect benefits of its activity are suffered to have weight in the consideration, '*lavishly*' more. I find the proof of this so well given in the last report of the Geologist, that I am saved the trouble of expressing it in my own language. Let us hear that report:

'Thus it appears that *whatever the State may outlay for the Canal and facilities to the coal proprietors under seventeen millions of dollars, is perfectly secure from the downward coal trade alone*, supposing that trade to be equal to and never exceeding one million of tons.'—Geologist Rep. p. 36. The Geologist goes on then to compare the coal trade on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal with the same trade on the canals of Pennsylvania; and allowing the increase in said trade after seven years to be only in the ratio of the increase of the population in the districts accessible to the coal, he presents the following consideration as '*abundant to demonstrate the immense value which should attach to the region*, inasmuch as it shews that the State will be receiving at the end of

7 years after completion,	more than	8 per cent.
10 do.	do.	nearly	9 do.
15 do.	do.	9½ do.
20 do.	do.	more than 10 do.

upon all her past, present and future investments in the work, assuming the estimates of last year to have been correct, and that the work can be finished in two years from this time.'—Geol. Report, page 37.

The subscription of one million on the part of the United States must have imparted a wonderful '*vitality*' to the Canal; since some how a project, which the Tax-Payer states to have been '*killed*' by a mere *report* about eight millions, should have been able to withstand the heavy blows and hard hammerings of an actual outlay of *ten millions*. Was this the will of the people, or was it *Galvanism upon a dead horse?*

But leaving this question, it is apprehended that the demand for '*probable*

profits' is abundantly answered by the quotation above given; and this part of the subject is therefore concluded with only one or two remarks upon some accessories to the inquiry.

How is the holy zeal of the Tax-Payer against the 'three foreign and rival cities' to be made consistent with the apparent satisfaction with which he dwells on the increase and avail of the Pennsylvania coal mines? And how does the spurning of a subject, because it is not a *Maryland* work, agree with the hearty kicks bestowed upon 'four counties' of Maryland because one of them looks as if approaching the market which a 'vast and powerful interest' (but a 'foreign and rival' one,) has already 'pre-occupied.' With entire respect to the writer, these passages are almost enough to make us doubt if his production ought to be deemed a *Maryland* work.

The winning-post of the Tax-Payer appears in view at the close of his communication; and this is nothing more nor less than to make the rail road, which like the Canal, is tending to Cumberland, a substitute for the Canal, down to Cacapon dam, or lower. *To use the rail road as a feeder to the Canal!!* This is *dry-nursing* that would hardly support the living, much less give animation to that which, according to the Tax-Payer, was 'killed in October, 1826.' It is, in short, nothing more than prohibiting to the Cumberland coal, the satisfaction even of a 'fight' against the vast and powerful (*Pennsylvania*) interest which has 'pre-occupied the market.'

PAYING FOR A DEAD HORSE, TWICE OVER.

THE reading public have seen, and the non-reading public have doubtless heard, how pertinaciously Mr. MERRICK, our worthy Senator in the Congress of the United States, has been struggling to have a bill passed surrendering to Maryland the stock belonging to the United States and the cities of Washington, Alexandria and Georgetown in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and that he has succeeded so far as to get such a bill through the Senate.

But how many persons are there that know the effect of this bill so strenuously advocated by Mr. M.?

It would be natural to suppose that it was to confer some great and lasting benefit on Maryland. Not at all.—The effect of the passage of Mr. Merrick's bill into a law will be to extract from the pockets of the people of Maryland, **TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS FOR THAT WHICH IS CONFESS-EDLY WORTHLESS—TO INCREASE THE DEBT OF MARYLAND A QUARTER OF A MILLION, FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE INDIVIDUAL STOCKHOLDERS OF THE CANAL COMPANY, INTO WHOSE POCKETS THE MONEY IS TO BE PAID.**

In 1838 there was an Act of Assembly of Maryland passed, chapter 396, which we will refer to, as we believe it is not generally recollected by those most interested. It is entitled 'An Act relating to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal.'

The first section 'authorises and requests the Governor to negotiate with the Executive of the United States for the surrender to this State of the Stock of the Cheapeake and Ohio Canal belonging to the United States, and the Cities of Washington, Georgetown and Alexandria, upon the condition that this State will complete the said Canal to Cumberland, with as little delay as possible.'

The second section makes it the duty of the Governer, 'if the surrender is made, *to offer to the several individuals owning stock in the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, fifty per centum on the PAR value of their stock, payable at the loan office in the city of Baltimore, in certificates of stock, or bonds of the State, at the option of the seller, drawing an interest at the rate of five per centum per annum, payable quarterly, and redeemable at the pleasure of the State at any time after fifty years from the date thereof.*'

Now what is the stock of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal worth? Nothing! What do the holders of it think it worth? Nothing! They have been sued for their instalments on it, again and again; they have heretofore not been able to give it away even. It has been to them, like Sinbad's old man of the sea was to that worthy mariner—nearly the death of them. And now, thanks to the generosity of Maryland, *they are to be paid FIFTY dollars a share for it.* Of what use will it be to Maryland? There is half a million of it. But if there was but half a dollar of it, why buy it, if it is worthless. No wonder there is but little opposition to the surrender made by the citizens of Washington, when such are to be its precious results.

The fact is, Maryland is too poor to take the present the Senator from Maryland is so anxious to have made. It is bad enough to have spent as much as has been spent on the Canal. It is bad enough to contemplate the prospect of having, one day or other, a late day we hope, to spend more in the work of actual construction; but it will be paying for the dead horse twice over, if the worthless stock of the Canal Company, held by individuals, has to be purchased, as provided in the law in question, by the people of Maryland. Look to this matter well, members from Maryland in the House of Representatives. A TAX-PAYER.

DELTA, III.

HOW TO USE DEAD HORSES IN CARRYING COAL.

THE plan of the Tax-Payer, in his second communication on the subject of the Canal, is to occupy the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road, for some 35 or 40 miles of its course, in carrying coals through *Virginia*, to be discharged at dam No. 6, in order to make the Canal at once 'profitable, as far as coal can make it profitable—without a dollar of farther outlay.'

It must be admitted that this writer bestrides his 'dead horse' as gallantly, if not as effectively, as if his steed were a real living one; but unless some arrangement could be made for a supply of the same sort of *ci-devant* animals, (whose 'keep' would cost nothing) to the said rail road, it is to be apprehended that the scheme, when tried, will turn out more benevolent than practical.

It would be somewhat curious to see a calculation made upon this subject, by a person who had access to information upon all the items. Here is one, however, which may serve in the absence of any other; though it is not known if the system of rail road feeders (less fortunate than the Canal) will be 'guessed into shape' in consequence.

The coal now sells in Cumberland for \$3 per ton, and when the demand comes to be greater, it will hardly be sold for less. It is assumed that this price covers the mine-owner's profit.

Then we have, (without troubling ourselves to hunt out from the documents the exact distances,) according to the Tax-Payer, 40 miles of rail road delivery. It is hard to say what this will cost, for we do not know if the rail road company will buy the coal, and deliver their own, which is one way; or whether they will leave coal dealing alone, and carry it at a fixed tariff for others. What shall that tariff be? The actual relations of bulk and weight in the two cases of *coal* and *flour*, do not vary very materially. In *packing*, the same weight of flour will take up rather less room; and in *loading*, less time. Therefore flour ought to be at least as cheap to convey as coal; unless the covered and locked cars make some grand difference.* But flour is carried now at 4 cents per ton per mile or more, without much profit, on the rail road; and if coal cost the same, the transportation to Cacapon would be per ton 1 60
Making with the price at Cumberland 3 00

In all,	4 60
---------	-----------	------

which is a dollar or two dearer than the coal proprietors estimate it will be carried for on the Canal the whole way to Georgetown.

In short, as the delivery at Cumberland on the one hand, and the carriage by Canal from Cacapon on the other, are the same in both cases, the question of difference amounts to this: to find the difference of toll and transportation on 40 miles of rail road and 40 miles of Canal.

If the rail road will be content, from any considerations, to take for toll and transport *one cent per ton per mile*, then it will be as cheap as on the Canal, but not till then.

There is but one more consideration necessary to this part of the subject: which is, that *the rail road is not yet at Cumberland*. The plan of the Tax-Payer only meets one contingency by another: it proposes to supply a Canal with coal by means of a rail road, but *a rail road not yet made*. If this be not **TO USE DEAD HORSES IN CARRYING COAL**, it is something very like it.

* The flour cars on the rail road, are to some extent, as I since understand, *neither covered nor locked*.

DELTA, IV.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

THE last communication of the 'Tax-Payer' in the American of 12th February, is devoted to a criticism upon the efforts of our worthy Senator (Mr. Merrick) to procure for the State of Maryland the cession of the 2,500,000, of Canal stock held by the United States. As this cession has not been yet effectuated, any discussion of it now is merely fighting with a shadow, or *riding a dead horse*; and this part of the subject, therefore, is passed over to some more appropriate period, in order to apply ourselves to the more agreeable and profitable task of presenting, as was at first promised, a brief general view of the whole matter and relations of the Canal.

It would not be without interest, both for the benefit of 'the reading public and the non-reading public,' to have the affair treated in detail; as thereby many little matters of documentary history could be brought again to light, to serve as elucidation for several points of past legislation, upon more topics than the Canal only. But such details would occupy much room, and would lead us away from the main point, which it is our present object to illustrate. Therefore, we shall express here only the chief ultimate conclusions to which our own researches have brought us; and shall reserve the arguments or facts for sustaining those positions, until some occasion when they appear more immediately serviceable, or called for. We shall ask for the admission without proof of only these following postulates, or axioms, as our readers may please them to be called.

1. That it is possible, by analogy with existing cases, to draw correct inferences as to general commercial results for any given case: and that, in regard to public works of intercommunication or internal improvement, it is possible, by comparison with an assemblage of existing similar circumstances, to arrive at conclusions which are indisputable.

2. That in all cases of works of internal improvement, the *indirect* advantages of their use (calculated nevertheless, as aforesaid, upon existing analogies) are fairly to be admitted, along with the *direct* advantages, in estimating the final value of such works.

With these two admissions, it may be safely affirmed that the following positions are capable of being fully established, either by general evidence or by special facts.

I. The Canal, in seven years after its completion to the coal region, *will be worth to its then proprietors intrinsically more than an active capital of thirteen millions of dollars*, employed in any ordinary way.

II. Within three years after such completion, the new taxable property thereby created or brought into the State, will, of itself, bear to be assessed to an amount exceeding the annual interest upon the whole sum now required for its completion as aforesaid.

III. Within the last mentioned period, a money capital, chiefly derived from sources outside of the State, will have been assembled (to be located in the county of Allegany and the city of Baltimore,) equal to two-thirds, at least, of the aforesaid sum required for completion. The advantage of such accumulation of new capital (bringing with it, also, a new population equal to the one thirty-sixth part of the entire present census of the State,) is manifest.

IV. Within the first mentioned period, the interest of the city of Baltimore in the Canal, at present slighted or obscure, will become manifest and paramount. She will then be supplied from the mines in Maryland with as much fuel as she can need, of better quality than is now anywhere accessible, and at a cheaper rate than is now furnished; *so that the aggregate saving to her citizens will not be less than the interest upon one million of dollars.*

V. If a link of 40 miles of rail road communication should continue to be thought an efficient means in promoting or carrying on a coal trade, there will be abundant opportunity for developing the results of experiment on that exact distance, by means of the Washington Branch Rail Road; without risk to any but the rail road company.

VI. If a cross-cut Canal should be deemed to confer any advantages upon Baltimore, the occasion, at the time mentioned in the 2d article, will be much more opportune for the construction of such cross-cut than it has ever yet been.

VII. If Baltimore should be, by the efforts and good will of her citizens, made the coal-mart of the State of Maryland, and possibly of the United States, one great effect in such circumstance will be an *important alteration in the present balance of trade, and consequent exchange* between our city and the more northern Atlantic ports.

VIII. Even if Baltimore is not so constituted the mart of coal, she will, nevertheless, feel the benefit of this alteration in exchange: in being, of necessity, the main grocery market for the greatly augmented population that will come to exist in the western region of the State—*all of the said supplies for which will have to be conveyed to Cumberland upon the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road.*

IX. Within the period first mentioned, the monied and commercial interests of the State Treasury, of the population and proprietors of the coal field, of the city of Baltimore, and of the cities of the District,—so far from being dissevered or adverse, will be found to harmonize; and if promoted by a just reciprocity of action, cannot, in the nature of things, fail to produce a maximum of advantage to all, far beyond, perhaps, what is now appreciated on behalf of any.

EDITORIALS OF THE BALTIMORE AMERICAN.

A communication which appeared in one of the papers of this city was recently copied into the National Intelligencer with some editorial remarks. It related to the affairs of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and was intended as a reply to certain articles signed 'A Tax-Payer,' published in the *American*.

There is only one point which we design to touch upon in this connection. The writer of the communication endeavored to show that the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was a Maryland work in the same sense in which the

Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road is a Maryland work—because an equal portion of each lies in the territory of the State. Now if the *termination* of the road like that of the Canal was beyond the borders of Maryland, the analogy would be exact—but that small difference changes the aspect of the comparison entirely. The point where a great channel of trade disembogues is the most important point of the whole line, as it is the one which concentrates the great sum total of the traffic. The Canal runs through a few counties of the State and it conveys the trade of those districts *out* of the State. If the termination of the Canal was at Baltimore, then the whole commonwealth would derive advantage, for this city is the great market for the rest of the State; and in proportion to its prosperity and ability, the farmers of the counties will find ready sales and good prices for their produce.

At present the Canal is *not* a Maryland work in a fair sense of the term, except in so far as the State has spent money upon it which yields no revenue. It is a matter of importance that this investment should be made productive if possible. But when the first step that way involves an increase of debt, it is the part of prudence to pause a while. Let it be ascertained how much will be requisite to the completion of the work, and let the basis of this estimate be the amount which it has cost thus far—taking care at the same time to note how far the actual expenditures have gone beyond previous estimates. It would be worth while too, before granting additional sums, to inquire into the manner in which former appropriations have been expended. The work hitherto has apparently possessed the absorbent qualities of a sand bank—and like that it has yielded nothing back in the way of fruitfulness.

Another important query would be whether the rail road when completed to Cumberland might not serve as a means of conveyance from Cumberland to the point where the Canal now stops. The mineral region of Allegany lies some ten, fifteen or twenty miles from Cumberland, and if the Canal should be continued to that town, the coal and iron from the hills would have to be conveyed to the canal boats by rail roads running from the mines and furnaces. Why might not the same sort of transportation be continued on the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road to the point where the Canal terminates now, which is we believe within some forty miles of Cumberland? There will be, most probably, a gradual descent in the road for the whole distance.

These are considerations which should be taken into the account before any farther increase is added to the State debt on behalf of the Canal. A cross-cut to Baltimore is essential to the final completion of the work; and when the State moves again in the matter it should be with ability enough to secure that.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

THE State has begun to feel the actual pressure of her public debt, and is staggering under the burden. The efforts of her ablest men have been enlisted, and their ingenuity taxed to the utmost, to devise means for paying the interest of the debt and other pressing liabilities. Public confidence is shaken, the credit of the State is no longer available, her bonds both at home and abroad are depressed in price beyond all former precedent, and the terrible reaction which is to be expected from Europe, in the utter prostration of American credit as a probable consequence of the late financial explosion in Philadelphia is looked to with dismay. To these causes of alarm and embarrassment are now unhappily added others, not less urgent and startling in their character, arising out of the critical state of our foreign relations.

And it is under such circumstances of alarm and distrust in the public, and

of exhaustion in the State, that a strenuous effort is making to wring from her a heavy appropriation to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal.

The course pointed out to the people of Maryland, in their present alarming position, by sound policy as well as by common honesty, is peremptorily to set themselves against any increase of the public debt, except for objects of the most imperative necessity, insist upon the adoption of a system of rigid economy and retrenchment in the administration of public affairs, and then, and not before, to encourage and cheerfully submit to the imposition of any system of taxation which may be necessary to meet the obligations of the State and preserve her faith unimpaired.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal is not a work in whose favour an exception should be made. Completed as that work now is to dam No. 6, the only section of the State specially interested in its continuation to Cumberland, is Allegany county; and however ready we may be to aid in the development of the mineral resources of that county, yet, representing as she does only the one-hundredth part of the whole taxable value of the State, we do not go far before we reach the limit of any reasonable sacrifice in the State at large for that purpose. The argument that by a further expenditure of the amount necessary to complete the Canal to Cumberland, the seven millions already invested will be made productive, is believed to be utterly fallacious; and it will require stronger arguments than have yet been urged to satisfy the citizens of Maryland that the work will yield an adequate revenue even upon the additional outlay required for its completion to Cumberland. The report of the State Geologist has been made the vehicle of an elaborate recommendation of the work to the favour of the Legislature. Its arguments and calculations may be left to the judgment of those upon whom they were intended to act.

I merely allude here to the Report for the purpose of calling public attention to the fact that its calculations are based, in part, upon the supposition of the completion of the Canal by the State, not to Cumberland alone, but to the mouth of Savage river. The friends of the Canal have hitherto cautiously kept out of view the design of imposing upon Maryland the task of filling up the gap between Cumberland and the coal mines. That, they have always declared, would be done by private enterprise. The lowest estimate of the cost of a slack-water navigation, which is the cheapest mode of connection, between Cumberland and the mouth of Savage river, is six hundred thousand dollars; and those who are conversant with the history of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal estimates, will believe that they are approaching nearer to the real cost in doubling that estimate. Without this connection, the Canal completed to Cumberland, is but little better as to the promise of revenue, than the Canal completed as now to dam No. 6. Who can doubt, under these circumstances, that if the State is inveigled into the measure of completing the Canal to Cumberland, the burden of the connection with the Savage river will also be thrown upon her?

The words of the Report in question are ominous upon this point:

'It is hardly to be believed that the Canal proper will ever be extended beyond Cumberland; and at this place it has not reached the coal trade upon which its utility and value depend. To wait until the necessary connection with the coal basin shall be made by individual enterprise, would be retarding to an almost indefinite period the profits which the State expects eventually to derive from it.'

Again: 'So far then as calculations upon reasonably assumed facts laid down in the preceding pages can be relied on, it would appear from what has been previously said, that the State is perfectly justifiable in advancing up to an outlay of seventeen millions of dollars for the Canal and slack-water navigation up to the mouth of Savage river.'

MARYLAND.

DELTA, V.

To THE EDITORS OF THE SUN:

Gentlemen,— Your correspondent Delta, will be obliged to you if you will publish in to-morrow's paper, the following article, which was written as an answer to certain editorial remarks in the American of the 20th inst., upon a communication appearing in your columns.

The article was written in the expectation that the American would itself insert it, for the reasons which are expressed in it; and accordingly, on Saturday, Delta caused the inquiry to be made of the editors whether they would so insert it on Tuesday, which latter day was taken instead of Monday, in order to afford Delta time for such a perusal and consideration of the remarks as would allow of justice being done both to the editors and to himself. From some immaterial circumstance in the economic arrangement of the American office, a definite reply could not be given on Saturday; but from the mode in which the inquiry was made and the answer requested, Delta had good reason to believe that the subject would be noticed in the American of the 22d. As no such notice appears, he must of course construe the fact into a declension of the insertion requested. He therefore comes back willingly to his old stand in your columns, which only a notion of courtesy induced his desire to leave. The inferences which may be drawn as to the intrinsic validity of that side of a question whose advocates do not desire to give full scope to the arguments of the other, Delta leaves, as immaterial to himself, to the sagacity and good sense of the public.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

DELTA TO THE EDITORS OF THE AMERICAN.

In the American of the 20th instant, the editors have been pleased to notice a communication, relating to the affairs of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, signed Delta, appearing originally in the Baltimore Sun, and thence copied into the National Intelligencer. In their notice the editors express their 'design to touch upon one point' of the said communication, in reinforcement, it is to be presumed, of 'certain articles signed a Tax-payer, published in the American,' to which said communication 'was intended as a reply.'

As it is of great importance that this subject be properly understood, for the action upon it now, either one way or the other, will affect for ever the interests of the State; and as Delta is compelled to confess that he does not find any of his positions infirmed even after the editorial reinforcement of the Tax-payer, he desires to avail himself of the urbanity of the editors to present in the American some comments upon their remarks. He does this both as respectful to them and in order that his response may meet the eyes of the same readers who might have perused the remarks, and thereby, as he thinks, encountered some misapprehensions. For these reasons only he leaves, for this purpose, the ground which before he occupied in the SUN.

He begs to make one more remark by way of preface, viz: that he does not enter upon this subject from any vanity of argumentation or hope of idle victory in the discussion, but in a calm research for TRUTH. If, therefore, he can be satisfied that his deductions are inconclusive, and that the defect does not lie in his own want of ability to draw logical inference, but is inherent in the premises themselves, no personal interest which he may feel in one or other determination will prevent a cheerful acknowledgment of his mistake, and a glad grasping of truth when he finds her. All he asks is the same acknowledgment from the other side under the same circumstances.

And now to business.

1. The editors misapprehend Delta when they say 'he endeavoured to show that the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was a Maryland work, in the same sense in which the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road was a Maryland work.' The articles published in the American were content with mere affirmations or negations, as you may please: the endeavour of Delta was to establish general definitions by which such affirmations or negations should be tried. He applied those definitions to the Canal, and *found them all to fit*. He applied them, in farther illustration of their fecundity and use, to the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road—a work which happened to stand next in order of amount invested by the State. Whether they fitted that work *throughout*, he did not stop to ascertain: he left the road 'for aught he had to say,' just where he found it. The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, Delta well knew did not require its claims to be brought in, bolstered upon the shoulders of parity with any other work, whether *in* the State or *of* the State.

2. Even if such had not been his opinion, and he had sought to obtain such a peerage (when he had already established *pre-eminence*,) for the Canal, he must beg to disclaim the merit of having used the reason whose authorship the editorial remarks assign to him, viz: 'because an equal portion of each (Canal and Rail Road,) lies in the territory of the State,' and this for the simple reason that no such equality of apportionment existed. The ratio between finished Canal and finished Rail Road in this regard, Delta knew to be about as 136 to 85; and when both works come to be of equal length, the ratio in the same regard will be as 180 to 85 nearly.

3. If Delta's former communication be read attentively, it will be found that the 'small difference' which the editors signalize in regard to 'the *termination* of the road like that of the Canal,' had not escaped his observation. He even allowed himself to term it 'a grand difference,' and treated it accordingly. There is however one thing which he must allow has escaped him, and which he believes is entirely new: namely, that 'the point where a great channel of trade disembogues is the most important point in the whole line,' and of consequence *more important than its source*. This may perhaps serve as a clue to the adverse fatality of Internal Improvements in our State as well as others: by showing that their projectors and directors and engineers have always hitherto looked through the wrong end of the spy glass.

4. In regard to the Canal's terminating at Baltimore, 'the great market for the rest of the State,' and the advantage thereby accruing to the 'farmers of the counties,'—as such termination is not now *actual*, Delta, as habitual with him, does not admit its discussion in reasoning which he desires only to base upon *facts*. He will only remark 'in this connection' that he has never found any of that respectable class of men, the butchers in our smaller city markets, when they became rich, selling beef any cheaper, or buying cattle any dearer. He apprehends that the 'farmers of the counties' may make analogous experience with regard to their respectable grocers and other merchants, when those dealers in the great market of the State, by means of the 'disemboguement of a Canal at Baltimore,' become able and prosperous.

5. But since this termination of the Canal at Baltimore is dwelt upon in more places than one in the remarks of the editors, Delta may perhaps be allowed to reason upon it in the relations which the editors have assumed; which reasoning he will make in the shape of a few questions.

If a cross-cut Canal is so important that the State must stop short in all her water-works until she can cut it across and then start fair, how is it that we are told, first plainly and positively by the Tax-payer, and then more modestly in the way of query by the editors themselves, that a rail road will serve for 40 miles from Cumberland down?

If a rail road will serve for 40 miles from Cumberland down, *why will not a rail road serve for just 40 miles from Washington across?*

Does a negative answer to these questions depend upon the *novel theory of the place of disemboguement* being more important than the place of origin?

In moral matters it may be admitted that it is of more moment *where Man is to go*, than *where he comes from*: but does this apply equally in mechanics?

Does the said negative answer depend upon the circumstance of the coal forming a *descending* trade on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal: insomuch that the probable 'gradual descent in the road for the whole distance' from Cumberland to dam No. 6, is effective to an extent that the Washington branch, which crosses sundry ridges, cannot reach?

6. In regard to the transportation of coal on the rail road, which may be equally applied to the upper end or to the Washington branch, Delta has already presented an estimate upon which his conclusions have been founded, and signified his curiosity to see one prepared by a more competent person. Until he is favoured in that method, he respectfully declines to give up his past conclusions; which are at least, to all appearance, upon more tangible ground than either the simple assertions or queries by which there has been endeavour to meet them.

7. The general definitions of what should constitute a State work, contained in the first communication to the Baltimore Sun, although by no means *all* that pertain to the subject, were yet thought sufficient to invest the whole ground necessary to be occupied in the discussion. But with entire respect for the editors, it must be said that they have succeeded in devising an additional and astounding characteristic; when they leave it to be inferred from their negative form of expression that 'a Maryland work, in a fair sense of the term,' is one on which 'the State has spent money—which yields no revenue.' If this is not an error of the compositor, or if the editors and their correspondents adverse to the Canal intend to make a *petitio principii* or postulate of it, all that Delta, as an advocate of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal has to say, is, that he thenceforth leaves all the honour of being called a *Maryland work*, dependent upon such a characteristic, to the several other public works in the State, to be shared, as they like, among them.

8. As to the question indirectly assumed on one side in the editorial remarks, viz: Which is in a most advantageous position, an *exporting* or an *importing* community—the political economists have not yet settled it for themselves; and besides, its long and complicated discussion would lead away from the main subject. Delta is, therefore, content to leave it where he finds it, without affirmal or denial. What he believes, however, could be substantiated on a fitting occasion as a true answer to the question, only tends to increase the strength of the several positions which the intrinsic force of his subject has enabled him to occupy.

With these comments, Delta makes his compliments to the editors of the American, in the belief that if they attempt to expose a flaw in his past or present reasoning, or to assume new grounds, adverse to his side of the question, they will do so with the same candor and logic with which he has endeavored to treat their remarks.

He begs space, however, to allude in a few words to an article signed 'Maryland,' appearing in the same number of the American, and from the similarity of its views to those of the editorial remarks, fairly to be presumed under the same patronage. As Delta is not one of those 'friends of the Canal who have hitherto cautiously kept out of view,' any measure into which he thinks now the State can be opportunely 'inveigled,' he leaves Maryland chiefly to those, if any such there be, whom Maryland's classification will fit better, and only refers to the communication at all because it comes in illustration of the main subject.

A considerable mistake seems to pervade the views of the writer when he affirms that 'the only section of the State specially interested in the continuation of the Canal is Allegany county.' This matter has been so fully anticipated in the Geologist's report, and largely expressed in the fourth communication of Delta, which appeared 'in one of the papers of this city,' (*THE SUN,*) that any one who takes the contracted side of the question, may fairly be expected to sustain it by something else than mere affirmation.

The same may be said of the assumed fallaciousness of the argument, that the continuation of the Canal will render it productive. Whose arguments are they that 'Maryland' so expeditiously quits! for there have been many past witnesses and advocates to this point. Are they the arguments of BERNARD, or of HOWARD, or (to come to our own contemporaries) of TOTTEN, of ANDREW STEWART, of MERCER, of the STATE GEOLOGIST, or of DELTA. Each one of these has examined the subject in his own characteristic way—to which one is the charge of having mistaken counterfeit arguments for true, to be applied?

And if 'Maryland' requires stronger arguments than have been yet urged, what part of the subject will he have re-inforced? for its out works, garrisoned within by the best interest of the State, are both extensive and strong. In what part of 'the vehicle of elaborate recommendation,' of which 'Maryland' speaks, does he find a screw loose or a pin out of place? And why, when he affirms of the report of the Geologist, that 'its arguments and calculations may be left to the judgment of those upon whom they were intended to act,' does he not so leave it, without darkening the Heavens with what he calls the 'ominous' words of the report, taken here and there, but giving nothing either of 'argument' or 'calculation?' The question for the main subject in this light, is not how 'ominous' the report of the Geologist may appear; but whether or not, it is well founded in fact and well supported in inference.

Delta thinks that it is, and with perfect respect affirms all argumentation adverse to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal *fallacious*, which does not first fairly upset the scientific and practical conclusions of the report.

Delta finds no reason to substantiate again here the accuracy of the positions which he has already taken in regard to the Canal being a State work, *par eminence*, in which not only the pecuniary, but the civic and moral interests of Maryland are involved to the highest and best degree: because none of those positions have been assailed otherwise than by a few random shots.

As to the 'ominous' warnings of 'Maryland' on the subject of the extension Canal to Savage, he will find on perusing the former communications of Delta, that the American of the 20th inst. did not give the first alarm to the commonwealth of this unexpected detriment: on the contrary, Delta has treated of it among other appropriate relations of the Canal; and shewn how its execution harmonizes in effect with the rest of a system, whose vigorous prosecution presents the only alleviation to our political disorders, and to those 'depressions,' 'reactions,' 'prostrations,' and finally 'explosions,' with which the communication of 'Maryland' teems.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

THE accounts from Annapolis concur in stating that the Legislature, though containing a greater than ordinary infusion of talent, energy, and honesty of purpose, are completely at a loss in devising means for meeting the present crisis in the finances of the State. That their position is one of extraordinary difficulty no one will dispute. A treasury bankrupt in means and almost in resources, heavy immediate liabilities, clamorous for settlement, an ascertained annual deficit in the revenue of a magnitude to alarm the most sanguine, the bonds of the State

depressed to a point which renders her credit unavailable, except at the most ruinous sacrifices, confidence shaken at home, American credit prostrated abroad, the political horizon clouded and threatening. Such are the circumstances that cause and justify their perplexity.

To decide, judiciously, upon the course to be taken amid such embarrassments, it is necessary to shake off all those extraneous influences, which sometimes upon occasions of inferior moment, are permitted to operate upon public measures. It is especially necessary to frown away certain influences, which, by an organized and concerted action, are brought to bear in favor of a further appropriation to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and which, having brought the State, as they think, inextricably within their toils, are now urging forward their selfish and ill-timed pretensions, and disturbing and confusing the deliberations of the Legislature. To the interest of Allegany county in that work, we would not deny its just weight, and the arguments addressed to the interest of the State as a stockholder, with whatever force they possess, may be legitimately urged. But the influence of a foreign and hostile interest, that of the District of Columbia, to which the prosperity and honor of the State are considerations of small moment when brought into conflict with the advancement of their cherished project—of joint stock companies and speculators in Allegany lands—of the holders, mostly jobbers and speculators who have bought it up at heavy rates of discount, of the four hundred and fifty-three thousand dollars of scrip issued within the last eight months by the Canal Company, in defiance of a virtual prohibition against such a proceeding by the Legislature of Maryland at their last session—such influences as these should be effectually removed from the discussion of a question involving so deeply the honor and welfare of the State, and the property of her citizens.

If the question, thus freed from all extrinsic bias, shall be considered dispassionately upon its own merits, it cannot be doubted that the Legislature will refuse to make a further appropriation to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal in the present perilous crisis of the State. Let them so decide, and let them pledge the State against an increase of the public debt, and for a system of economy and retrenchment, and they may fearlessly adopt such a system of taxation as may be necessary to meet the present emergency, with full confidence that it will be sustained and concurred in by their constituents.

MARYLAND.

DELTA, VI.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

THE present crisis appears so fraught with good or evil to the welfare of the State, according as our public councils may make their election, that I am sure all good citizens who read the SUN will not weary in having a few more 'last words' on the subject. When it is considered how variously constituted are the reflective faculties in different individuals, so that the argument which is conclusive for one, falls off unheeded from the mailed intellect of another, it will be acknowledged how impossible it is, in the limits of a single communication, so to exhaust a subject of civic importance that we may hope to have convinced the understanding or even attracted the attention of *all*. Therefore, and in view of the political moment of this subject, I have cheerfully devoted the time consumed in the preceding communications on the same subject; and I find still reason to pursue it farther.

I do not propose this time to occupy again and fortify the grounds previously covered by my conclusions; but as in my last letter, to the editors of the American, published in the Sun of the 24th inst., I made allusion and response to a communication over the signature of 'Maryland,' appearing in the American of the

20th, I shall trace here the remarks which appear over the same signature in the American of the 23d instant.

With regard to the picture which 'Maryland' has drawn there of the present condition of financial affairs, and which abounds, it must be confessed, in the gloomiest tints and most broken shadows, I have nothing to say now. For things which are physical and *actual*, every one must see with his own eyes the best he can; but for things that are hyperphysical and *abstract*, the responsibility is a little more social. In such cases, a man cannot go always by his own notions, but must be content to guide himself by the level of well-informed reason, and to measure amounts by a chain of well-constructed and well-connected arguments.

As, with great respect for 'Maryland,' he seems, in the argumentative part of his communication, to have gone far ahead of this well-established method, he will pardon me, and I hope the public interest will be served, in an effort to bring him, and others in a similar category, back to it.

'Maryland' admits *two* conditions upon which the result aimed at (namely, the refusal of the Legislature to make farther appropriation to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal) is contingent; first, that the question shall be 'freed from all extrinsic bias; secondly, that it 'shall be considered dispassionately upon its own merits.' The former case he has treated of only in general: the latter he does not appear afterwards to have taken in view at all.

In relation to the first, he has told us somewhat about 'certain influences' (which a 'frown' is to dissipate;) about 'an organized and concerted action;' about 'inextricable toils' which have been laid in dark places to catch the unwary; about 'selfish and ill-timed pretensions;' and about something or somebody who is 'disturbing and confusing the deliberations of the Legislature' to such extent that I suppose the 'infusion of talent, energy, and honesty of purpose' which he ascribes to that body, will have to be *strained* before it is fit for the patient to take. But he no farther particularizes than merely to refer to the 'foreign and hostile' cities of the District of Columbia,—cities, the blood of whose inhabitants is as much of *Maryland* as that of Baltimore itself, and who only left the territorial jurisdiction of Maryland that she might have the honor of containing the precincts of the most sublime Areopagus that our world-history can shew. And in the same *obiter* mode, he refers too to the 'joint stock companies and speculators in Allegany,' who, we are to believe, in the dark chasms of their mountains are taking lessons and aid from the gnomes and salamanders that have been translated from their old-haunted Hartz to the Alleganies, or with whom, perhaps, Rübezahl himself, in some new fit of earth-visiting, has been making unhallowed contracts, and is bartering supernatural powers: so that they are enabled to make turbid the 'infusion' of mental and moral faculties, which appertain to our Legislature. And so he alludes too to 'the holders, mostly jobbers and speculators who have bought it up at heavy rates of discount, of the four hundred and fifty-three thousand dollars' of Canal scrip.

Now an *organization* implies persons to be organized, just as as a *concert* requires musicians: and this novel process of 'disturbing and confusing the Legislature,' until 'they are completely at a loss' what to do with themselves and the State, can only be effectuated by persons who are banded together for the purpose, and who take respectively their appropriate parts in the game. Moreover, the existence of such an organization cannot be certainly and accurately known, unless the individuals (or at least some of them,) are known who compose it. Therefore, it follows, that a writer speaking confidently of the circumstances, must know a good deal about them; and under a strict code, he might perhaps be considered *particeps criminis* to the extent of his unrevealed knowledge about what, under the same code, would be considered as little less than *high treason*, viz: wilfully 'disturbing etc. the Legislature.'

But it may be possibly thought too invidious a task for a writer like 'Maryland' thus to designate the individuals in such a horrid conspiracy against the quiet and somnolency of the General Assembly. At least, however, he may fairly be asked to describe their plans and furnish the protocol of their 'concert.' Let him tell us how the 'foreign and hostile' cities of the District (though garrisoned by our own kinsmen and scions of the same stock,) are urging 'the advancement of their cherished project.' Let him describe its bearings, and analyse in our presence the deadly composition of argument and interest which gives effect to their artillery. Let him describe the attitudes of the various 'joint-stock companies and speculators,' crouching in some obscure passage and watching the victim of their 'inextricable toils,' until the moment for the fatal spring. And let him detail the methods employed by the 'jobbers' to secure their part of \$453,000; investigate their claims, and give us the common and statute law bearing on the subject. The 'Adventures of a Guinea' is a very amusing book; perhaps equal interest might attach to the 'Adventures of a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal note,' from the moment when it first felt the pressure of the engraving rolls, until the period when it was safely lodged, much the worse for wear, in the wallet of a 'jobber,' who has the audacity to think public credit worth something. Advantage might also be taken to give an episode touching the life and times of one of its brethren, a Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road note.

I agree with 'Maryland,' that these circumstances are all of 'extrinsic bias;' they form the shroud which must be torn from the dead body before dissection. But **LET HIM TEAR AWAY THE SHROUD**, before he plunges a scalpel in the body; and let him hold it up, in all its sickening deformity, that we may see it. We want to judge of the condition of that body, which, according to another writer in the American, was 'killed in 1826,' by Gen. BERNARD.

When 'Maryland' has done this, we will then 'dispassionately consider' the subject 'upon its own merits.' And if the arguments brought out on his side are able to stand the searching analysis which the friends of the Canal will be prepared to apply to them, and to come out unaltered from that crucible of truth which they believe themselves to possess in the present regard; then it is fair to presume the Legislature will be left to do their duty in peace; and then, and not till then, 'Maryland' may enjoy his participation in the desolate triumph which will follow the proof that the past stupidity of the counsels of the State whose name he has assumed, are only to be equalled or atoned for by their recklessness for the present and the future.

DELTA VII.

WHAT OUGHT THE STATE TO DO?

Answer I. **LAY A DIRECT TAX, RATED UPON THE EXISTING COUNTY ASSESSMENTS**, collectable by the county collectors, and returnable in the shortest possible time.

Any other method of attaining the object, even if it is systematised with angelic perfectness, is likely under present circumstances to fail of its end. A long bill indicative of a new system, whether well or ill-drawn, will be broken down by its details. The friends of the measure will be made lukewarm or disgusted by some provision or other which there is not now time to discuss or remove; and the enemies of the measure will seize with promptness the occasion to evade the merits, while they are denouncing the details, of the bill.

Such a bill as I have mentioned can be contained in two sections, or *one* if you like it; and its advantage will be that it brings nothing into discussion but the principle, that *the State, like her citizens, is bound to pay her debts.*

Make provision if you please for a future adjustment of a new system ; and if required, make it retrospective to the year 1841 : but do not hazard the vital interests of the State in the attempted passage of full and precise legislative definitions upon a subject whose chief merit after all is its absolute necessity, and which is then best handled when it is done quickly.

Answer II. LET THE VARIOUS BANKS IN THE STATE BE REQUESTED TO FURNISH TEMPORARILY THE MEANS to meet the demand for interest up to 1st July next; receiving a pledge of the income of the tax to reimburse the advance.

No benefit can come from any discussion on this point ; all parties would soon recognize it as the best policy to acquiesce silently in the arrangement.

Answer III. LET AN APPROPRIATION BE MADE TO FINISH THE CANAL TO THE COAL MINES, of say \$3,300,000 ; one-half of the stock for which, to be issued this year, the other half next year.

It is abundant in evidence that this is the true and only method of relieving the State in a few years of her present difficulties. And if those stocks cannot be readily sold at home or abroad in quantity, means may be used to remedy the defect.

The causes of the depreciation of American stocks in the London market were principally these: *First*, the large amount of such stocks introduced in a comparatively short period ; *Secondly*, the apprehension, consequent upon this and other circumstances, that the States, who were very well known in London not to have generally adopted a system of direct taxation, would not make provision for punctual payment of interest ; and *Thirdly* and subsequently, the rumors of possible belligerent difficulties between England and America.

In the present situation of Great Britain, with similar prospects looking towards other nations, the last cause becomes inoperative. Every time a State hesitates to make suitable provision for dues of interest, the second is perpetuated and stimulated, and vice versa. And as the London bankers do not allow themselves to be so ignorant of our affairs as some persons suppose, directly they find the State governments acknowledging and meeting their engagements, the sole question in regard to the first, will be whether the State bonds for a large or small amount are issued in behalf of works which have a reasonably guaranteed prospect of success and profit. They know already to discriminate between the different States ; the discrimination will continually become more marked in favour of those who adopt the policy indicated. And should that policy become general, there is not an intelligent banker in London who will not confess that American stocks are become ‘a better security for permanent investments than any thing in Europe.’* The effecting of this consummation is in our own hands.

Answer IV. If necessary let the State make an authentic depository, (the treasurer or commissioner of loans,) of the aforesaid stock ; and let her authorise the Canal company to issue notes of various denominations, based upon this stock so deposited—somewhat in the same manner as has been done with regard to the City stock in the rail road.

It is not proposed to argue the principle of this course, but to suggest its expediency and its probable entire practical applicability to present exigencies.

These four things are what the STATE MAY DO, and the three first, what she OUGHT TO DO.

* These words are quoted from a letter received from London only yesterday, (1 March.) They are used by a correspondent, who has been for a half century actively engaged in one of the most respectable banking houses in London.

EPISODE.

THE FROSTBURG COAL-DISTRICT.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

I have just read the extraordinary article in the American of Saturday, 20th ult. upon the subject of this great work, signed 'Maryland.' It enjoys the advantage of a week's impression upon the public mind (so far as the author knows) uncontradicted. But I trust it is not yet too late to correct its fallacies and misrepresentations. Although the blow at the Canal has been delayed to this late period, when some of its statements might not be met and overthrown, it is hoped that the vast importance of the subject will yet give the writer a hearing.

'Maryland' does not deal in argument, nor does he furnish facts. He seems to hope by boldness of assertion, to give weight to his article. He urges that the completion of the Canal will not make the \$7,000,000 productive, and that the Canal never will yield an adequate revenue upon its outlay. This is mere *brutum fulmen*. The most cursory examination will convict it of error. Let us look for a moment to other Canals. Sir John Sinclair, in his statistics of Scotland, states that in 1814 there was transported to the city of Glasgow, (with a population of 177,043) on the Monkland Canal alone, 47,338,284 bushels, which, at the rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ a cent a ton per mile from Cumberland to Washington, would amount to \$1,893,529. The dimensions of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal are greatly superior to these of the Monkland Canal. The tonnage on the Schuylkill Canal, engaged principally in the transportation of coal, was equivalent to 12,483,672 bushels; and the coal actually consumed in Philadelphia in 1833, was 11,565,000 bushels. The population to be supplied with Cumberland coal was computed as follows:—

The District of Columbia, population	45,000
The city of Baltimore, do	100,000
The counties and towns of Virginia and Maryland, bordering on the Potomac and Chesapeake Bay,	600,000
Aggregate population,	745,000

Suppose this population, to use no more coal than the city of Glasgow, although that city has but one-fifth of the above population, yet would the tolls from the Canal, as shown above, amount to more by far than an amount sufficient to realize \$600,000—the interest on \$10,000,000, which will fully cover the cost of the Canal when completed.* These calculations, to one unaccustomed to reflect on the subject, sound extravagant; yet experience justifies them. The rate of *coal* Canal Stocks speaks volumes on the subject. The following list shows the selling prices and dividends of these Stocks in England on this subject in the year 1822.

	Share.	Selling prices.	Div'd.
Coventry,	£100	1070	44
Erewash,	100	1000	58
Forth and Clyde,	100	470	20
Loughborough,	100	3500	170
Neath,	100	410	25

* These calculations are taken for the most part from the able report of Mr. Stewart on this subject, to the Convention held in Baltimore, in 1834.

	<i>Share.</i>	<i>Selling prices.</i>	<i>Div'd.</i>
Oxford,	£100	730	32
Stratford and Worc'e,	140	700	40
Stroudwater,	145	995	22
Trent and Mersey,	100	1710	75
Grand Junction,	100	245	10
Leeds and Liverpool,	100	305	12

Now in this account of the probable revenue of our Canal has not been considered that which must arise from our lumber, (of which we have vast forests) from lime, iron, marble, the transportation of merchandise, grain, &c. as well as of passengers. All these items must go to swell up its vast amount of revenue. And to these facts should be added, that recently communicated to the New York Legislature, by Gov. Seward, that the *nett* tolls of the New York Canals for the present year are considerably *upwards* of \$1,000,000. I have not his message by me to give exact numbers. Upon these Canals *coal* does not enter into the revenue as it will in ours. More might be said on this part of the subject, but I fear taking much space in you valuable journal. I trust, however, enough has been adduced to show that 'Maryland' is far behind all experience in his views upon the subject.

But we are told that 'the friends of the Canal have hitherto cautiously kept out of view the design of imposing upon Maryland the task of filling up the gap between Cumberland and the coal mines,' and that the Canal, when completed to Cumberland, will be of but little more service than in its present state, terminating at dam No. 6, and that it can never be available until finished to Westernport. The statement that the friends of the Canal have ever contemplated taking it beyond Cumberland to the mouth of Savage river, is entirely incorrect. No one, *but those who are interested*, have ever dreamed of such a project, and no one the least conversant with the localities of the coal field, could ever regard such a project as serious. What? take the Canal to Westernport, (thirty miles distant) when the Frostburg coal field presents the most illimitable and inexhaustible beds of the richest coal and iron ore, only nine miles distant? The proposition stultifies itself. It cannot be made the subject of an argument. It has been advanced to the injury of the Canal, by one who surely knows nothing of our county and its localities. It is true that Dr. Ducatel has thrown out some suggestions as quoted by 'Maryland' upon this subject. But Dr. Ducatel is not the organ of the Canal. Its friends repudiate his statements. The moment his Report was published, they were met and denied in the Cumberland Civilian. Major John Powell, an able and practical Geologist, who resides at Frostburg, as also another lucid anonymous writer, in that paper, dissected the report as far as relates to the Canal, and demonstrated its utter fallacy as to the Frostburg coal field. Major Powell shewed that this field alone, which, as remarked, is but nine miles from Cumberland, is wealthy in coal and iron ore beyond all calculation, and would of itself, supply for ages the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. As to the second part of the proposition, that the friends of the Canal wish the State to carry the Canal beyond Cumberland, Major Powell remarks:

'There are already five companies established in the Valley of Jennings' run, viz: the Allegany, the Clifton, the Boston and New York, and a company on the Pennsylvania side of the State line; there is likewise a coal property belonging to S. B. Barrell, Esq, of Boston, equal in extent to that of any of the companies, and besides these, there are about 6,000 acres of coal lands, out of which it is probable two other companies will shortly be formed. On Braddock's run, there is the Maryland Mining Company, and a part of the lands of the Union

Company; there are likewise several coal tracts still belonging to individuals, the collective amount of which is, perhaps, equal in extent to the property of the Maryland Mining Company; we may therefore consider, that there are ten companies, which will be ready to employ the Canal for the transport of their coal, so soon as it has reached Cumberland.

I am well acquainted with the prospects and intentions of four of these parties, and can safely affirm, that they have never contemplated carrying on operations on a smaller scale, than that of sending annually 150,000 tons of coal to market; two of these companies propose a still more extensive operation; if, therefore, at the opening of the Canal, only half the companies go into operation, and I think that number, at least, certainly will, nearly 800,000 tons may be expected to be sent down it the first season, from which a sum will be derived more than sufficient to pay the interest upon the capital advanced by the State.'

Major Powell has been in the employment of the companies for years past, and his statements may be relied on. But to show how far 'Maryland' is out of the path of truth when he makes these random statements, I must add another fact. So far from the companies desiring the State to finish the Canal to the coal fields, *some are in fact at this moment applying to the Legislature to allow them to make such a canal with their private means!* They want to do this very thing. But without any canal communication to the coal fields, it is well known that the freights by wagons and the rail roads of the companies will bring enough coal to the Canal to justify every expectation of its friends. There is a constant descent from the coal mines to Cumberland, so that freight by either coal wagon or rail road is every way inviting. Could 'Maryland,' however, behold the millions of bushels of coal, which are even now freighted to Cumberland by wagon, invited hither by the temporary freshets of the river, which occur only several times in the year, his doubts would be at once dissipated as to that point.

But I have already trespassed sufficiently upon your columns. I trust that I have succeeded in pointing out the errors of this enemy of the Canal. I will only add that not the least of his errors is in the statement, that Allegany county is most specially interested in the completion of the Canal. This might have been so a year or two ago,—but the matter has ceased to be a sectional one. The whole State is directly interested in it. If the Canal is abandoned, or its completion procrastinated, where, I would ask, is to come the money to pay for the interest of the State debt, embarked in its behalf? *It must come for the most part from Baltimore.* In Baltimore is concentrated the greater part of the wealth of the State, and from her must be drawn the greater part of the interest of the State debt. To abandon the Canal is to cut off the only means to get rid of the State debt, and to entail an enormous tax on the people of the State forever and forever. To procrastinate its completion, is to lose a vast amount, as well as to continue our finances in the same embarrassed condition as at present. *Hereafter,* (if it be procrastinated) the Legislature will have to do what it might now do. But to finish the Canal, is to provide a fund, (by all the ordinary and sensible modes of calculation) to relieve us from our financial difficulties,—to throw open the locked-up wealth of the Alleghanies,—enrich our State, and finally to provide a nett revenue to the State. We have now a Whig Legislature. On them rests a vast amount of responsibility to the good people of this State,—let them but act as becomes them, and the people will send them a safe deliverance.

OLD ALLEGANY.

DELTA, VIII.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL, AND THE COAL FIELDS.

In the Patriot of the 1st March, there is a communication over the signature of 'Old Allegany,' in relation to both the above subjects, which appears to me to contain some statements that require comment and correction; and silence as to which, by one who has been uniformly a friend to the Canal and to the interest of the State involved in it, might be construed into an acquiescence in the position which the writer of the said communication has gratuitously imposed upon the friends of the Canal, one and all.

So far as the object of the said writer is to controvert the statements made by a correspondent of the Baltimore American, I have nothing to say; except that those statements had been commented upon, and as I think satisfactorily answered, a week before in the SUN of the 24th of February. I am well content that 'Old Allegany' or any one else, should clinch the nails which I have driven. I must only beg him, however, with a due regard for the safety of the vessel, to take care that he does not *draw them out*, in order to attempt a re-driving more to his fancy.

What I have to remark upon, however, are passages such as this: 'The statement that the friends of the Canal have ever contemplated taking it beyond Cumberland to the mouth of Savage river, is certainly incorrect.'

The writer, before venturing to include so many persons in such a sweeping category, had better have ascertained how far the numerous friends of the Canal in all sections of the State, would be pleased in having their opinions thus circumscribed by a person who plainly writes under a local influence; or as well, he might have given us a definition of his orthodoxy, so that we might know on the threshold, whether the caps of his manufacture would fit our heads; or still better for his own sake, while he was searching into the antiquities of the English Canals, he might have found time for a glance at the past history of the work in view. He would then have been aware that Gen. BERNARD and Dr. HOWARD, and Col. TOTTEN, who have been usually considered 'friends of the Canal,' at first *presumed as a matter of course that the Canal will be extended to Savage*, and when from some technical consideration they indicated a preferred route which left the glen of the Potomac at Cumberland, they still *presumed as a matter of deep and important interest that the Canal would be extended to Savage*. [Doc. 18th Congress, 2d session Senate, 32, pp. 15, 19. Doc. No. 10, 19th Congress, 2d session, p. 81, ss.]

Nor did the administration of the Canal itself 'repudiate' these views at any time. They continued for a considerable period (at least as long as Gen. MERCER presided) to be deemed part and parcel of the work; and they only ceased to be brought forward in that light when in 1835—36, the Canal had to struggle for a languid existence, and the sanguine presage of those who had acquired other interests in the coal-field, induced the hope with some, that the State, by the liberality or cupidity of private enterprize, might come to be dispensed from doing what was even then considered essential to the full avail of the Canal. And from that period to the present, there have never been wanting true 'friends of the Canal,'—witnesses of the truth—to express upon decent occasions their adhesion to the propriety of these original, but now (in the new light which 'Allegany' sheds on the subject,) 'repudiated' views. 'Dreams' he terms them—dreams of '*those who are interested.*' If dreams at all, (which they cannot be, unless Gen. BERNARD and Capt. MCNEILL were *asleep* when they reconnoitred that country, and so unfortunately became not 'in the least conservant with the localities of the coal-field,') and the former and Dr. HOWARD slumbered amicably together over a

glass of *eau sucré*, while they wrote their report,) they are the destiny-weighing, fate-foreseeing ‘dreams of Jove.’

But farther, the Canal administration kept the subject open until, by the adoption of the present level at Cumberland, they seemed to decide it for a while. Even in that aspect, I have it, however, from the best authority, that the contingency was regarded by the administration as not far remote, when the location of the old Maryland Feeder Dam would have to be again occupied, and a slack-water navigation extended as far as Read’s, on the Potomac.

Now, after these facts, upon a matter which ‘Old Allegany’ professes to be unable to make ‘the subject of an argument,’ (and to give him his due he has not acted or written inconsistently with his profession,) the verdict of the writer in the Patriot leaves but this dilemma for the eminent characters who have discussed it. Either they have ‘stultified’ themselves, or they intended all their elaborate surveys and reports not to be regarded ‘as serious’—but by way of joke!

The reader, therefore, will not be surprised, after this conclusion, in regard to the Board of Internal Improvement and others, whose reports, I suppose, were not ‘by’ the writer when he wrote, that the *GEOLOGIST*’s Report should be treated with as little ceremony and ‘dissected’ by lucid anonymous writers—because his examinations and investigations led him to the adoption of the ‘dreams,’ ‘stultifications,’ or ‘jokes’ of Gen. *BERNARD*. For myself, I must confess, I read that report, when it appeared, with pleasure: because it seemed to me, as I have already elsewhere remarked, an able exposition of the truth. It is by the statements which have been all along made in regard to the Canal and the coal-field—statements beyond all reasonable probability, and as unnecessary for the end which they were intended to subserve, as they were improbable—that the Canal has fallen into discredit. It is by such statements that the State will find herself, if she ever finishes the Canal to Cumberland and stops there, wofully deluded: and the burden of her disappointment will be that she was ‘wounded in the house of her friends.’

But since the writer has brought in his ‘dissections,’ let the reader go along with me, and hear the lectures on Anatomy. With regard to the communication of Mr. *POWELL*, in the Cumberland Civilian, as it is always etiquette to reply to a person, who puts his citizen’s name to what he thinks proper to publish, in the same manner, I shall abstain from any comment on it, and will only take the liberty to extract and italicize one passage. ‘*It must be admitted*,’ says Mr. *POWELL*, to whom I suppose both ‘the lucid anonymous writers’ will bow, ‘*that the arguments of the Professor (the GEOLOGIST,) respecting the advantages which would enure to the main Canal by the completion of a communication between Cumberland and Westernport are incontrovertible.*’ Now here is another dilemma which the writer in the Patriot has started. Either, Mr. *POWELL* is not a ‘friend of the Canal,’ or ‘its friends’ do not ‘repudiate the statements’ of the Geologist. The ‘advantages which would enure to the main Canal,’ are precisely the ones which the Geologist affirms he was investigating and exhibiting;—as an officer of the State, those were all he had a right to regard; and if his mode of regarding them is pronounced ‘*incontrovertible*,’ the ‘dissections’ may stop at this point.

But for the benefit of the public, let us hear the ‘lucid anonymous writer.’ The first beacon-fire which ‘Allegany’ of the Cumberland Civilian lights is, that ‘it is well known that the accessible portions of ‘this coal field’ do not amount to the one-twentieth of this (the Geologist’s) statement of 86,847 acres. Therefore, the accessible coal and ore beds do not extend over as much as 4,343 acres. Now, Mr. *POWELL*, as quoted by the writer in the Patriot, speaks of the possessions of five companies, a coal property belonging to some private individual equal in extent to any, and a supererogatory extent of 6000 acres of coal land, I suppose

accessible coal, about to be parcelled out among two companies more. Now, here is a third dilemma for 'lucid anonymous writers ;' and one of the two Alleghanies must be out in his premises.

The next passages of the first Allegany are so little 'lucid,' that a track through them, reminds one (and if he is a classic, will remind him upon re-reading them in print) of the Roman poet's description,

Quale per incertam lunam, sub luce malignâ
Est iter in sylvis.

And a following passage is so *pellucid* in error, that I am surprised that the editor of the Civilian did not for his own credit correct it, viz : that all the States in the Union are not worth 1,600,000,000 dollars.

I leave, however, the 'lucid anonymous writers' to arrange their discrepancies with Mr. POWELL or others the best way they can ; and I conclude what I have to say now, by a few distinct observations :

1. It will be plain to every body, as it has always been to those who have informed themselves on the subject, that the extension of the Canal to Savage is *no novelty*.

2. The Geologist in again bringing it before the Councils of the State, has done so in an independent and conclusive manner. The 'organ' of the Canal he does not it is true appear to be—nor any other sort of wind or stringed instrument to be played upon—but that *these very sentiments of his produced the first and principal reaction in favor of the Canal*, before the Legislature, is a fact that can be supported by full evidence. If therefore the friends of the Canal find it proper to repudiate them now, it is without regard to their first impressions, and the avail which they have already had from the report.

3. How far admitting the objective and subjective statements of the Report to be 'incontrovertible,' (as Mr. POWELL, decidedly the most sensible of the critics of the Report, terms them) are consistent with a simultaneous 'repudiation,' I leave the writer in the Patriot, who has already some few other difficulties to jump over, to make out.

4. Even if the 'friends of the Canal' were really inclined, *en masse*, so to repudiate the Report, there would not be wanting one or two of sagacity enough to warn the rest of the gratuitous risk they were running, in throwing away an efficient piece of armor, merely because it was heavy, or chafed them. They would point out that the Geologist differs from the mass—supposing that mass to entertain similar views with the writer in the Patriot, which is very far from being the case—only *ex abundanti*. He, like them, admits that the Canal is going to be profitable—he, like them, urges it on the State for that very reason : and only *not* like them, he rests his admissions and urgency upon analogous facts, instead of overgrown statements, which are but calculated to mislead. If the Frostburg District can export in the first year, or any time, a million of tons of coal, that export is not affected by any suggestion which he has made : *if they cannot*, the interest of the State, as well as the modesty of those local advocates, will be sorely at a loss.

5. A Canal stopping at Cumberland will be the only large Canal in the world going within ten miles of a coal formation and there stopping because the proprietors of the coal cannot agree among themselves. In England, almost without exception, the Canals pass through the Coal districts.

6. The Frostburg proprietors have always so positively and clamorously asserted their ability to supply the Canal with coal without any extension nearer them, that they must not be surprised if we gave credit to their assertions : otherwise and if they admit now that they want something else besides a gradual and 'inviting descent' along a turnpike, there is nothing in the Report of the GEOLO-

GIST, or elsewhere, adverse to it. For myself, whose main interest in this regard is that the Canal pays an interest as soon as possible, I should with pleasure hear of the results of a special examination over the Frostburg District, which went to shew that there was coal enough in that district to warrant the construction of an extension.

7. The same Frostburg proprietors, if they allow themselves to be represented by the writers who have taken up their local side, seem to be very sore under a supposed neglect of the Geologist to present their claims in the 'neat not gaudy' colour which would by them be deemed appropriate. With this part of the subject I have not much to do. For myself, when I read the heading of the section, I did not suppose that the Geologist was about to furnish us with a special criticism of each locality, and to perform the invidious task of discriminating between the several companies: nor was I disappointed. When from the peculiar circumstances of the case he found it necessary to particularize one company in the Frostburg district, they are left to speak their own words: And if there is no magnificence of promise of \$100,000 annually in commutation of tolls from that or other companies, it was, I suppose, because they were not then prepared to make it, and therefore very properly kept themselves uncommitted. It is only a pity that they could not have furnished the Geologist with such statements, that would have added interest to the Canal.

Finally it is much to be regretted, that the advocates of the Canal who have enough to do when in phalanx, should be compelled to resort to a method of *bush-fighting*, which no more discriminates between friend and foe. If the position of the Frostburg district is what its lucid anonymous writers represent, then it hardly needs an extension Canal; but whether or not, an extension to Savage can do that district no harm. On the contrary as it is admitted to be 'incontrovertible' that much 'advantage will enure to the main Canal' from such extension, the State has all the inducements she wants to dictate its construction. When the same inducements are presented for an extension into the Frostburg district and the proprietors there begin to perceive a mistake into which they seem to have fallen, viz: *that their coal has the property of carrying itself to market*, Delta answers for himself (and if the Geologist is what his manner of reporting would indicate him, would almost venture to answer for that officer,) that he will be found as actively and sincerely on the side of *that* extension as the one at present in view.

But if instead of this result, lucid anonymous writers from that part, persist with indiscreet zeal to prefer claims not for themselves but adverse to others, the time is not far off when the friends of the Canal will be obliged really to repudiate such writers and their statements together.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

I regret that the article of 'Delta' did not, on account of an unusual irregularity in the mail, reach the hands of 'Old Allegany' until this (Saturday) evening. This fact will, I trust, be a sufficient apology for my seeming inattention.

In order to a perfect understanding of the matter in issue, let me rescue it from the levity of the style, and the infelicitous and unpropitious pleasantry of this writer. My object is to discuss the proposition—not to measure lances in the arena of jest or ridicule.

The controversy thus arises. Dr. Ducatel, in his report, intimated that the natural termination of the Canal was at Westernport, and that the expectation of the State as to realizing profits, might be frustrated by not taking the Canal to that point. And further, that the great bulk of the coal was at Westernport, forty

miles from Cumberland. From these views, Dr. Ducatel thinks the State ought to finish the Canal to the mouth of Savage river. With what avidity these facts were seized upon by the enemies of the Canal, and in what insidious manner they were identified with the Canal Company, we have already seen. 'Maryland,' in the American, took this advantage of them. The object of 'Old Allegany' was to demonstrate the fallacy and the incorrectness of the views of the American's correspondent, as to the yield of all coal Canals, and particularly the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. In this 'Delta' and the writer agreed. But 'Old Allegany' went further. He denied the statements of Dr. Ducatel in reference to the Frostburg coal field and the intentions of the Canal Company, upon which the article of 'Maryland' was based.

'Delta' is the patron of the Westernport Canal. I care not whether he *totidem verbis* discloses his bias to that object. All his remarks tend that way. He means that the Canal *should* be extended to Westernport—he means that the Westernport coal field should be reached by the Canal—he means this or he means nothing. I am not to be diverted from the true issue, by collateral and minor questions growing out of the statements of writers to which I referred. I referred to those writers for the simple purpose of showing that *here upon the spot*, we were prompt to repudiate the heterodoxies of Dr. Ducatel, in reference to the Frostburg coal field.

Let us come back then to Dr. Ducatel's report, for the matter in issue resolves itself into the correctness or incorrectness of that report. And here let me not be misunderstood. I did not say that the Cumberland writers dissected the *whole* of Dr. Ducatel's report. If 'Delta' will turn to my article, he will find that I confined the statement to the Geologist's remarks respecting the *Frostburg coal field*. That the Geologist's report contains a body of information respecting our mineral wealth and other resources, we cordially admit. It is in reference alone to the propriety of the State finishing the Canal to Westernport, before it can be made available to the State, that we must decisively repudiate his statements.

The matter, then, is resolved into the correctness or incorrectness of this view. I meet the Geologist with the statements of Major Powell, whose knowledge of the Frostburg coal field is founded upon many years residence in contact with it, aided by a profound general acquaintance with the science of Geology. I meet him with the various reports upon that field, which have been repeatedly made to the several companies engaged in developing its buried wealth. I meet him with *settled public opinion* upon the value and the inexhaustible and illimitable wealth of the Frostburg coal field.

But again. 'Delta' indirectly, (I hope unintentionally) countenances the idea that the State is to fill up the gap between Cumberland and the coal fields. Let me deny it emphatically and earnestly. The friends of the Canal do not desire it. I meet the misrepresentation by the fact, (which I insisted on before,) that the incorporated companies, operating in the Frostburg coal fields, are, at this moment, asking the Legislature to allow them to finish the Canal to the coal fields, out of their private means! This is a well known fact in the Legislature.

Let me now defend my statement as to the friends of the Canal never having had it in contemplation to carry the Canal to Westernport. This is the supposed vulnerable point at which the shafts (*tela imbelle*) of 'Delta' are directed. That statement grew out of the view of Dr. Ducatel as to Westernport being the natural *terminus* of the Canal. In other words, it was stated that the friends of the Canal had never contemplated taking the Canal to Westernport *as a terminus*. This is evident indeed from the next sentence to that in which it is contained. Nor does the quotation from Gen. Bernard upon that subject, at all impair the statement. Gen. Bernard had doubtless in view, (for I have not the document

at hand) the two great routes then in contemplation, by which the Canal was to mingle the waters of the Ohio with those of the seaboard. One of those routes was designated as the northern, by Castellman's river; the other the southern, by the Savage river. The former having been determined on, Gen. Bernard presumed that the Canal would be extended to Savage. Not as *the terminus*. No; for another route had been determined on. And this contemplated extension was regarded as merely ancillary to the main work. Dr. Ducatel insisted (indirectly, at least) that the Canal Company should at once terminate the Canal at Westernport, leaving all other routes out of the question. It was the object of the writer to meet that view, and no matter how general his language may have been, it can be tortured (when fairly construed) into nothing other.

My object has been simply to maintain the position of my first article. I maintain that the State ought to finish the Canal at once to Cumberland—that she is justified by every sensible calculation in so doing—that she is invited to do so by every consideration of prudence and profit, and that any other policy would be suicidal to all her interests. I insist that the proposition to take a Canal from Cumberland to the mouth of Savage river, (forty miles distant and of far greater elevation,) when we have a treasure richer than all the Indies, only nine miles distant, is too wild and extravagant to demand refutation. Even at the risk of offending ‘ears polite,’ I will repeat that it stultifies itself. I deny that the friends of the Canal ever contemplated making Westernport *the terminus* of the Canal, and I call for the proof. I deny that the friends of the Canal have the most distant idea of forcing the State into filling up the gap between this point and the coal fields, and again refer to the application made to the present Legislature by the incorporated companies for that purpose.

OLD ALLEGANY.

DELTA, IX.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL, AND COAL FIELD.

THE Patriot of the 10th of March, contains the rejoinder of ‘Old Allegany’ to a former reply of ‘Delta,’ upon the subject. I have taken occasion of my earliest convenience to surrejoin upon the same matter. And as it is a great pity that injury should be done to the prospects of the Canal by the disagreement upon small matters of those friends, who otherwise tolerably well accord in the main, I shall be as brief as possible in closing a discussion not likely to be profitable to the end which both disputants profess to have in view, and the greater stirring of which, only serves to put that end—the Canal itself—in proportionately worse odor.

I shall, therefore, only make a few preliminary remarks upon the rejoinder, and some of its parts; and shall then state the amount of my accord or disagreement in the final issue of ‘Old Allegany’s’ last paragraph.

As the writer objects to the ‘levity’ of my usual style, and to that ‘pleasantry’ which pervades it, and which he has found ‘infelicitous and unpropitious’ (I suppose) to the success of his side of the question, I will do my best to treat the matter in a style that is grave, though I must studiously avoid making it *heavy*; however much I would otherwise be pleased to gratify the opposite counsel.

1. My first remark is upon the rather inaccurate manner in which ‘Old Allegany’ has stated the rise of the ‘controversy.’ If the Geologist’s report be examined, it will be seen that so far from intimating ‘that the natural termination of the Canal was at Westernport;’ this village is never once mentioned in connection with the subject. Only five times in the whole report is the name even (*Westernport*) used; viz. pp. 11, 16, 32, 34, and then under circumstances to exclude entirely the statement of ‘Old Allegany;’ for amongst other things, when

the report speaks of the distance from Westernport to Cumberland, it calls it 28 miles, and not 40, as the writer says, nor does the Geologist anywhere say that the 'bulk of the coal is at Westernport,' or any other designated point. How far the conclusion that the Canal ought to be finished 'to the mouth of Savage,' agrees with these premises which 'Old Allegany' makes for the Geologist, I leave the writer to make out.

2. So there is a similar inaccuracy in his definition of the position of **DELTA**; when he calls that writer 'the patron of the Westernport Canal.' **DELTA** has never directly or indirectly alluded to a Westernport Canal; nor has he ever used the name of Westernport in the whole course of his former reply, nor as well as he recollects now, elsewhere, on this subject. He leaves to the readers of both sides how far the sweeping decision of 'Old Allegany,' 'that he means a Canal to Westernport, or he means nothing,' is consistent with this state of facts, and with another fact that throughout, emphatically and in italics, he spoke of the Extension Canal, as going properly to the mouth of Savage. As the whole always includes its parts, it may be under some circumstances affirmed that an advocate for a particular portion of a scheme, conceals under his ostensible advocacy, a lurking desire to effectuate at some future period the whole scheme. But the device or figure by which an open friend of an entire scheme is to be termed a friend of partial interests, and then coolly told that 'he means to gain those partial interests, or he means nothing,' does not strike me as very remarkable for its correctness either rhetorically or otherwise.

3. I am willing to believe that all these inaccuracies have grown out of another; which I now indicate, viz: the *supposition that the GEOLOGIST has called the whole basin of the Potomac, George's creek and Jennings' run, by any other name than the Frostburg coal field.* I myself think the appellation a misnomer; but from the distinctness with which it was applied, I did not find in reading the report, cause to anticipate such a confusion as 'Old Allegany' has made of it; nor do I find now, any reason to suppose that I 'misunderstood' the former article of the writer, in regard to the *extent* of the 'dissections' of the Geologist's report. The remarks of that officer 'respecting the Frostburg coal field,' are his remarks touching the whole basin. A more careful perusal of the report in question will make this apparent.

4. The statements which the writer tells us 'we must decisively repudiate,' are tainted with the same error: for they are altogether his own and not the Geologist's. The report nowhere says the Canal is to be finished to Westernport.

5. But putting all those discrepancies aside as possibly 'typographical errors,' (which the 'lucid anonymous writer' in the Civilian benevolently supposed 'the mathematical inaccuracies' of the report to be) or as 'collateral and minor questions' apt to grow round about and hide the main issue; or finally as a hasty impression—adopted without full documentary proof; and admitting (for the sake of getting through these remarks) that the reprobation which the writer bestows upon an imaginary Canal to Westernport was intended for a projected one to Savage, let us hear what new views of justice or briefs of proof the writer offers 'in resolving the correctness or incorrectness' of the Geologist's view, additional to those which he gave us before.

He first proposes to meet 'the heterodoxies' of the Geologist on this subject by the statements of Mr. POWELL. Unfortunately for him, whenever such a congress takes place, Mr. POWELL is already committed to go arm in arm with the GEOLOGIST. '*It must be admitted,*' says Mr. POWELL, '*that the arguments of the Professor are incontrovertible.*'

He secondly proposes to meet the Geologist with the whole army of reports 'upon that field, which have been repeatedly made to the several companies en-

gaged in developing its buried wealth.' There could be hardly any thing more curious than the assemblage of such a meeting: and of the two desirable characteristics for lookers on, viz: to be *merry* and *wise*, more food would be afforded I apprehend for the former than for the latter. But to remark more seriously: the reporters to whom he refers are, I presume, those who have treated of possessions in the Frostburg coal district. In such treatment they had no occasion to consider the relations of other points of the coal basin, and cannot therefore be fairly antagonist of the geological report, any more than in a court of law the special decision of a judge upon any point can be met and overruled by an *obiter dictum* of another judge.

His third defence is '*settled public opinion* upon the value and the inexhaustible and illimitable wealth' of a field which, according to the 'lucid anonymous writer' of the Civilian, contains less than 4,340 acres of 'accessible coal!!' Public opinion is doubtless a good thing to have upon one's side; but it is rather difficult upon the same subject to hold *two* 'public opinions' at the same time.

6. Recommending, then, 'Old Allegany' to hunt out some other and more 'propitious' auxiliaries against the GEOLOGIST's heterodoxy, let us see the forces which he has brought against the idea, which he attributed to DELTA, 'that the State is to fill up the gap between Cumberland and the coal field,' (not 'fields.') First comes his 'denial,' which, however 'emphatical and earnest,' is rather inapplicable to an *idea*, however it might be appropriate against a *fact*. Secondly, a repetition of what was already commented on as inappropriate, viz: the gratuitous assumption of the representativenesship of the 'friends of the Canal' for a few proprietors in one district of the coal field. Thirdly, comes a fact, that the incorporated companies about Frostburg 'are at this moment asking the Legislature to allow them to finish the Canal to the coal fields out of their private means.' As this is a new fact, and in spite of reasonable inquiry, remains new to me—all I have to say is, that it is a pity that this 'well known fact' is not better known to the Legislature, and to refer for my opinion on it to the closing paragraphs of my former reply. So far as the Legislature have to do with a matter which is fully within the province of the Canal Company to regulate, I am sure they would be very much obliged to the Frostburg proprietors for finishing the Canal, not only to Cumberland, but to dam No. 6, or any other dam that it may be convenient to those proprietors to reach.

7. In the most good-humored recollection of the kindness of 'Old Allegany' in his efforts to rescue the understanding of the matter from the 'levity of my style' and my 'infelicitous and unpropitious pleasantry,'—he would have at least as much ground for obligation, were I to rescue his defence of his 'statement as to the friends of the Canal never having it in contemplation to carry the Canal to Westernport,' from some faults a little more serious. This, however, I shall not do in full, but only make one or two remarks in relation to it. The statement so defended growing, as the writer says, 'out of the view of the Geologist, as to Westernport being the natural terminus of the Canal,' and the whole report of the Geologist not containing any such view—it follows that the statement has no ground to grow on; which was exactly what I concluded in my former communication. Farther, the didactic part of his defence, which is applied in a somewhat imaginative manner to the elucidation of Gen. BERNARD's views, will be considerably modified, I have no doubt, and improved by a perusal of Gen. BERNARD's report—a recommendation to read which, I hope 'Old Allegany' will receive in good part and apply to good purpose.

And now having finished my preliminary remarks, I come to the final issues, which the writer sums up as maintained by him. The positions of his first article which he re-claims, I think he must in part give up, inasmuch as it is matter

of his own admission that the object of that article was to meet an assumed view of the Geologist—which view is no where to be taken from his report, and which may be supposed then to be non-existent.

He next maintains ‘that the State ought to finish the Canal to Cumberland.’ Agreed.

‘That she is justified by every sensible calculation in so doing.’ Agreed.

‘That she is invited to do so by every consideration of prudence and profit.’ Agreed.

‘That any other (opposite) policy would be suicidal to her interests.’ Agreed.

It is so pleasant to me to go on in this way of agreeing, like ‘brethren who dwell together in unity,’ that I wish I could keep along farther. But the next proposition is a stumper, and is altogether remarkable for both the accuracy and logic of the facts and their synthesis.

And here I am going to record a fourth dilemma, in addition to the three others in my former reply—neither of which, I beg the reader to remember, have been answered or solved. ‘Old Allegany’ merely came up to them, looked at them, found them rather high, I suppose, and contenting himself with calling them by a few hard names, such as ‘collateral and minor questions, growing out of the statements of writers,’ (who have succeeded in giving their writings one of the tests of literary authenticity, namely, a certain discrepancy among themselves) turned aside.

This new dilemma is freshly raised, and is this: Either ‘Old Allegany’ is mistaken in the view which he takes of the nature of a proposition to connect Cumberland and the Savage river, or Mr. POWELL, who, one would think, had been too opportune for these lucid anonymous writers to excuse their placing him in such a position, and who ventures to think the arguments for such a proposition incontrovertible, has adopted an extravagant notion, ‘too wild to demand refutation.’ He has ‘stultified’ himself. I beg it to be remembered that these are ‘Old Allegany’s’ conclusions and words, not mine.

In the next place, the mouth of Savage is only *thirty* miles distant, not *forty* as stated by ‘Old Allegany,’ and ‘the far greater elevation, 328 feet above Cumberland, is met by the fact that the Frostburg district is only 1,000 to 1,200 feet above the same point!!!

I must further notice the fluctuations in value assigned to the district by different writers; not that they are of any importance in themselves, but as they serve to shew the vagueness of the ideas of those writers. Thus the Allegany of the Civilian finds his good sense shocked by the supposition of the Geologist that the coal field is worth 1,600 million dollars—which amount his science in statistics leads him to conjecture, is worth more than all the States in the Union. He therefore cuts it down to the one-twentieth. But the elder Allegany, after endorsing as it were the statements of the lucid anonymous writer of the Civilian, and thus admitting the fractional reduction indicated, still thinks that 4,300 acres of the Frostburg field is worth more ‘than all the Indies.’

‘Old Allegany’ then goes on to deny certain positions which he has kindly assumed in behalf of all the other friends of the Canal: to all which, I have only to say, they are not my positions—and that, however successful the writer may be in overthrowing them, he has not advanced any nearer to the main question raised by him between us. He forgets, too, that he is proceeding in rather an inverse method in calling for proof from a defendant, before he has furnished his own.

And now in conclusion, as I hope, of this discussion, let me recommend to ‘Old Allegany’ to be contented with the advantages and wealth of the district in

which he seems to be interested, without disturbing himself about imaginary injuries to be inflicted on that district in the prosperity of others, and so creating division and inefficiency in the hands, who, as I said before, have enough to do when they are undivided. If he desires to disburden himself of useful facts, or momentous arguments, let them be of a character, and applied in a direction, that will operate upon the common enemies of the whole field: but let not his guns be so placed as to scour some of the bastions of the very citadel we are jointly defending.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

IN a communication of the 8th of January last from the President of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company to the Legislature of Maryland, the amount required to complete the Canal to Cumberland, including the payment of its outstanding engagements, and valuing its State five per cent. bonds, unsold, at 80, is stated to be \$2,525,000.

A rapid review of the history of former estimates as contrasted with actual cost in the progress of the work heretofore, will be useful in enabling us to form a tolerably correct opinion of the probable actual cost of such completion, based upon the estimate given by the company.

The first contribution by Maryland, subsequently to the original subscription of \$500,000, was made in the spring of 1834, when she subscribed an additional amount of \$125,000. In the session of 1835, the company obtained a further sum of \$2,000,000, upon an application accompanied with minute estimates to show that that sum would be sufficient for the completion to Cumberland. The act passed on this occasion was entitled an 'Act to provide for the completion of the Canal to Cumberland,' and appropriated for that purpose 'two millions of dollars,' or so '*much thereof as should be necessary.*' At the very next session, barely twelve months afterwards, the company again applied to the Legislature and acknowledging and endeavouring to explain and excuse the errors of their former calculations, presented new estimates for the correctness of which they fully vouched. The application was successful and they obtained the required sum of \$3,000,000. This appropriation was made early in June, 1836, and on the 15th of that month, the President and Directors of the Company declare to the Stockholders 'that the appropriation will, it is believed, be abundant to secure the completion of the Canal to Cumberland by the summer of 1839. A similar declaration had been made on the occasion of the two millions loan in 1835. After an interval of nearly three years, in the session of 1839, the Legislature was again applied to with revised estimates shewing the amount still necessary for the completion to Cumberland to be \$2,320,871 44. The Legislature granted \$1,375,000. At the next session, in the winter of 1840, final revised estimates were presented, by the company, and a requisition made for upwards of two millions of dollars. Their efforts were, on that occasion, for the first time unsuccessful, as it is to be hoped they will be now.

The present estimate of the company, as derived from the communication referred to, is \$2,525,000. To this sum add for erroneous statements and estimates and for the various contingencies inseparable from a work of such magnitude, $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent, equal to \$841,666, and we have the sum of \$3,366,666, as the apparent cost of the work.

The depreciation of the bonds of the State, consequent upon a heavy increase of the public debt at a moment when she is already confessedly involved beyond her strength, cannot fail to be very great. Estimating her six per cent. bonds to

net \$80 to the Canal Company, it would require to produce the above mentioned sum of \$3,366,666, an issue of \$4,208,333

Add for interest on that amount expended during the progress of the work, allowing only two years for its full completion to Cumberland, being an average of 12 months on 6 per cent. 252,500

\$4,460,833

The number of years to be allowed for the formation of connections with the coal districts by private enterprize, and for the development of the mines to an extent sufficient to furnish the Canal with a trade equal to the current and extraordinary expenses of the section thus completed, will be very variously estimated. Until that result takes place, the State, instead of receiving any return upon the investment is actually subject to an annual expense over and above the interest. If the period be computed at little more than three years, we must add to the preceding estimate, for mere payment of interest, without taking into consideration the annual excess of expenses over receipts, or any of the extraordinary casualties to which all Canals, during the first few years, are subject, 20 per cent, \$892,167

And we have, \$5,353,000 as the sum which the completion of the Canal to Cumberland will have actually cost the State of Maryland up to the moment at which the new trade thus opened may begin to yield, in the tolls upon its passage through the whole line from Cumberland to Georgetown, an annual revenue exceeding the annual expenses of the particular section between dam No. 6 and Cumberland.

MARYLAND.

DELTA, X.

A PLAIN CASE AND A SHORT STORY.

THE American of the 3d of March, contains another communication on this subject from their former correspondent 'Maryland,' upon which I propose to make a few remarks; and that they may be as brief as possible, I will not stop to allude particularly to the 'cut and dried' aspect of 'Maryland's' arguments, which partake of none of the local freshness of the Hour and the Man, nor to the sober steadfastness with which he perseveres in cherishing notions already refuted in special replications to his former communications, nor to the enviable serenity with which he declines notice of such refutations, (it may be supposed like a certain judge who would not hear both sides of a case lest *his opinions should become confused*) nor to his regular use of the very same arguments employed two years ago by the opponents of the Canal, which arguments lapse of time and other circumstances (I will not say 'Maryland's' treatment of them) have as regularly weakened. Nor shall I stay to discuss his comments upon the misdemeanors and mistakes of the company and its administration. With that I have nothing to do. If the administration, engineering, financial or political, has been in error or crime, let the State, who has the power, put in better officers. For my own part I neither affirm nor deny the wisdom or necessity of such a conclusion.

I will only remark two points upon this topic, however:

1. That a good dish may be spoiled by bad sauce; and by analogy the *merits* of any plan or device in the moral or mechanical world, are not to be confounded with the *management* of such device or plan: and

2. That similar objections, on the score of under-estimating, &c., might be kept *in blank*, ready to be filled up against more than one of the internal improvement schemes aided by the State, besides the Canal, and so the taking of such grounds come to be dangerous, unless for a very active occupant.

Reservation being made of these topics, the pith of the argument at present of 'Maryland' seems to be this: that the Canal to be finished to Cumberland will cost a little more than five and one-third millions of dollars. This product (which I presume he offers as a maximum) is made up, nevertheless, of several doubtful, not to say improbable factors; such as 6 per cent. bonds of the State at 80 per cent. of their nominal amount, an allowance of *one-third* for what the writer is pleased to term 'erroneous statements and estimates,' and 'various contingencies' on 'a work of such magnitude' as about 25 miles of Canal, and then 6 per cent. interest on this contingent allowance!!

Distinctly stating that 'Maryland's' estimate rests upon nothing on earth but the writer's bare assertion, I yet assume it for the argument.

The interest chargeable upon the present investments on the Canal have nevertheless to be paid, even if the State uses the advice of the correspondents of the American; and I take this amount at what I have once before used it as being, viz: \$425,000 per annum.

Take a term of 5 years, which 'Maryland' has allowed before the Canal becomes profitable, and the disbursements on this account become, with simple interest, \$2,504,500—with 6 per cent. interest, compounded annually, (as it ought to be) the disbursements are \$2,539,500, a sum more than is asked for to finish the Canal: so that as far as the direct payment of the money is concerned, it is indifferent whether the State finishes the Canal or not. In five years time she will have disbursed just as much as would finish it, but without having gained the least advantage either in prospect or possession.

But now take a term of ten years, in which even the opponents of the Canal do not dare to doubt of its becoming profitable, and for five years of which its friends assert it will pay the interest upon the entire investment.

If the advice is acted upon to stop the Canal now, the disbursements on the score of accruing interest, upon present investments, will be by that time, (very nearly) \$5,938,000

Maryland's whole estimate, his gratuitous doubling of the official estimates, &c. &c., is only \$5,353,000

And the difference \$585,000
shews the *loss which the State will actually make* if she follows the wise arithmetical calculators and correctors of 'erroneous statements' patronised by the Baltimore American; *in addition to which she will have certainly sacrificed all possible prospect of advantage from the Canal.*

I think I have now made out *a plain case and a short story*; but as it is sometimes good to follow absurdities, as one does refractory school boys, into a corner, that their playmates may gaze and be better, I will yet take one more case in arithmetic.

Let the term be 19 years, until another eclipse of the moon, during which the Canal is stopped, and this stubborn demand for interest (which has been left out of view by the acute correspondents of the American) is continued, (for be it remembered, that in the clamor for 'stoppage' there is no talk of its being *unstoppable* hereafter, but the *dead horse* is to be left, I suppose, to the crows,) the disbursements will be (calculated as before) \$15,208,917, a sum considerably above what either the friends or enemies of the Canal have ever stated as the total likely cost for being carried into the very heart of the coal region.

And thus within 20 years, (a period which you and I, my reader, unless you are an old man, may reasonably expect to survive,) these far-seeing financiers would force upon the people of the State THE PAYMENT OF MORE THAN FIFTEEN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS to gratify their inconsiderate notions, and as the price not of *gaining* a long and justly cherished object, but of *throwing it away*.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL.

It has been shown that the actual cost to the State of Maryland of completing the Canal from dam No. 6 to Cumberland, up to the moment when she may begin to look for some return upon the additional outlay, ought not to be estimated at less than \$5,350,000.

A mere six per cent. interest upon that outlay, leaving the old investment as unprofitable as it is now, could not be urged as a sufficient motive for an expenditure which would subject the State to imminent risk of bankruptcy. And yet to afford even that inadequate return, requiring a net increase over the present receipts of the Canal of \$321,000, derivable exclusively from the completion from dam No. 6 to Cumberland, the resources of the Allegany region must be developed with such rapidity and to such an extent as to furnish, at once, an annual trade upon the Canal equal to more than one-third of its whole capacity. That capacity is, theoretically, estimated at one million of tons, and to pay the net revenue in question, at the present established rates of ninety-three cents per ton from Cumberland to Georgetown, would require not less than 350,000 tons per annum.

The hopelessness of the attempt to retrieve the *seven millions* already expended on the Canal, by persisting in its completion to Cumberland, is, therefore, so clearly evident from the magnitude of the sum required for that purpose, and the little probability of an adequate return even upon the additional outlay, that it is scarcely necessary to advert to the further obstacle which exists in the difficulty attending a timely foreclosure of the State's mortgage, a measure imperatively called for before another dollar shall be expended by her upon the work, nor to the still greater difficulty which presents itself in the just claim of Baltimore to a provision for a cross-cut Canal, upon terms of equality with Georgetown, in any bill making further appropriations to the Canal.

Common justice and sound policy both require that the pretensions of Baltimore on this point shall not be overlooked. Burdened as she is with a large proportion of the expense of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, a work which even in its present state operates confessedly to her disadvantage, she may reasonably claim that that burden shall not be increased, unless measures are at the same time taken to secure to her a participation in the benefits of the work upon which her means are thus lavished.

In view of the amount of her contributions to the public revenue, the city of Baltimore may be said to have virtually paid three or four millions of dollars towards the Canal already.* She cannot be expected willingly to pay two or three millions more to carry the Canal to Cumberland, with the alternative before her of seeing either her money wasted in a profitless experiment, or the cities of the District aggrandized and furnished with the means of commercial rivalry at her own cost.

The injustice of imposing upon the State of Maryland, in her present helpless and exhausted condition, a task which the General Government, notwithstanding its heavy interest in the Canal, does not deem it prudent to undertake, and in the execution of which not the slightest aid can be obtained from the State of Virginia, or the District of Columbia, although they are to enjoy almost exclusively all the benefits of the work, is too obvious to require notice.

Taking into view, then, the various considerations which irresistibly oppose themselves to the adoption of the measure urged by the friends of the Canal, the

* Of the whole revenue of the State from taxes in 1839, for example, the State Treasurer's report shows that full two-thirds were paid directly by the city of Baltimore.

[This assertion, though very round and plausible, happens unfortunately to be entirely a mistake.—*Ed.*]

alternative, which has been suggested, of using the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road for the transportation of coal from Cumberland to dam No. 6, is at least deserving of consideration.

Recent experiments have shown that where fuel can be obtained at very low prices, well constructed rail roads are able, with the present improved locomotive steam engines, to transport rough and heavy articles at surprisingly low rates. The cost of transportation under such circumstances has been the subject of careful investigation, tested in some instances by actual experiment; and the result is believed to warrant the conclusion that, with a reasonable sacrifice of their peculiar interests to the present great public emergency, which the city of Baltimore, the largest stockholder, has sufficient motive to sanction in her still more predominant interest in the prosperity and solvency of the State, the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road Company will be able to transport coal over the line in question at such low rates as to leave no room for doubting the expediency of adopting the alternative suggested.

The distance from Cumberland to dam No. 6, is forty-six miles by the line of the rail road, and fifty miles by that of the Canal. The cost of carrying coal by the latter, allowing only two cents per ton per mile for toll and transportation, would be one dollar per ton. With the moderate sacrifice called for of its own immediate interest to the public good, the rail road, there is reason to believe, will be able to transport coal over the line in question at from two to two and a half cents per ton per mile, or at a cost of from 92 to 115 cents per ton. At the first named price the coal would be transported from Cumberland to dam No. 6, at a cost absolutely less by eight cents per ton than by the Canal. At the second, it would cost fifteen cents per ton more than by the Canal, thus, at the worst, adding only half a cent per bushel to the cost of the coal delivered at Georgetown. If the resources of Allegany county are of such a character as to be perceptibly retarded in their development by this trifling drawback, the wisdom of completing the Canal even at the most moderate cost that has been imagined, may well be doubted.

The great Frostburg region, possessing as it does peculiar advantages in the means of a short rail road communication with Cumberland, and the Cumberland interest, which has to fear the establishment and growth of a rival depot at some favourably situated point of the slack-water navigation between Cumberland and the mouth of Savage river, might be called upon for their aid and influence in support of the plan recommended; but it is not desired, by an appeal to sectional jealousies, to bring prematurely into action, upon an occasion already sufficiently perplexing, the conflict of various interests and pretensions which is to be expected, should the Canal ever reach Cumberland, in the discussion of the modes of connexion between that point and the mineral districts.

MARYLAND.

DELTA, XI.

THE BOOK OF THE APOCALYPSE.

I INTEND this paper to serve for reply to an article which appeared in the Baltimore American of the 8th inst. on the subject of the Canal; and which was passed over at the time because (if even it needed an antidote) it was not certain that the General Assembly would be in convocation to avail of the remedy. But now that we are to have an extra-session, I again take the subject up, and in order to demonstrate both by analysis and synthesis my view of the question, I continue the method followed latterly (after having advanced ~~MY YET UNIM-PUGNED positions~~) of pursuing the various assailants through all their arithmetic and prophecy and fancy up into the corner where there is no help more against

the singularly mystified contradictions, among which their forgetfulness of facts or their neglecting to have concerted among themselves a plausible consistent story to be stuck to throughout, have one or the other involved them. And from the length and labour of the article just above referred to, and its plentiful besprinklement of imaginations and ‘things unseen,’ I suppose we have been now favoured with the final Revelations upon the matter; and that we have heard the address of the great Bonze himself—the Panjandrum and high priest, who has been seeking concurrently with various satellites to victimize the Canal upon the shrine of local prejudice or ambition. *Procul O! procul este, profani.*

Believe his Bonzeship and you will have your reward. You must have great faith: for the Evangelists which he declares, do not treat of things as they are or in the ordinary way. They are above or beyond or against nature, I do not say which. You may dispense with your ordinary faculties in giving credence; in them memory supplies the place of argument, fancy keeps the seat for facts.

Common people have thought it a safe rule (and Mr. Talleyrand sanctioned the same thing) to credit *half* of what you hear. Believe the Bonze in the American, and your credence must always be *double* of what you hear. The engineers of the Canal estimate two and a half millions for finishing their work, interest and all; the writer in the American, on account of ‘the contingencies inseparable from a work of such magnitude,’ sets down *five and a third* millions. Apply this to the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road, upon which there is twice as great a distance to be finished as remains for the Canal, and the three millions (*estimated* for that upon no more infallible authority) will swell up to *six*. Believe the Bonze, and you come to the consoling faith that the State, all bewildered and bedevilled, both by land and water, has nothing left for her future schemes of internal improvement but *aeronautics*.

Believe this new Apollonius, and you will be firmly convinced that your arm, 21 inches long, can no more reach down to a half dollar in a bucket of water 17 inches deep. For what else but this is the sage conclusion, that ‘the hopelessness of the attempt to retrieve the seven millions already expended on the Canal, by persisting in its completion to Cumberland, is therefore clearly evident, from the magnitude of the sum required for that purpose.’

Only have faith in this writer, my dear friend and reader, and do not give yourself any trouble to reconcile the ‘just claim of Baltimore to a provision for a cross-cut Canal’ with the repeated revelations of ‘the surprisingly low rates’ at which rail roads can transport ‘rough and heavy articles,’ and the consequent doing away with the western part of the Canal altogether.

Forget that there have been such persons as Aristotle and Watts and Whately; and then you will be prepared to receive with devout admiration such precious syllogisms as the following:—

The Canal to be finished, will take 5 millions;

It will be useless and unprofitable when finished:

Therefore, spend 10 millions to bring it to Baltimore:

And,

A rail road is quite as good as a Canal;

There is neither rail road nor Canal from dam No. 6, to Cumberland;

Therefore, stop the Canal and live in hopes of the rail road:

But there is a rail road from Washington to Baltimore;

Therefore, make a cross-cut Canal.

Shade of Aristotle!

The writer in the American would persuade us that taking in view some matters which are invisible, the city of Baltimore has ‘paid 3 or 4 millions of dollars towards the Canal already’!!! I do not see how this, even could it be estab-

lished, would alter the intrinsic merits of the question; but it would have been just as well for the writer to have been more accurate in his statements and more precise in his calculations. When he becomes so, and works out his sum a little better, he will have more reason for expressing an opinion as to what Baltimore can or cannot be expected to do.

Nor is he any more accurate in his statement with relation to the General Government's view of the Canal. He would have you believe that the State of Maryland, with ignorant prodigality, is about to incur expenditures which the discreet Federal Government, after full examination, 'does not deem it prudent to undertake.' Now either this writer is sadly deficient in information, or his zeal has outrun his knowledge, or he has used this word '*prudent*' purposely to delude. From the first days of Gen. Jackson down to the 4th March last, the aspect of the Federal Government towards this work, has been of entire hostility, not at all on the score of *prudence* but the score of *party*.

But the conclusion with which 'Maryland's' wordy tissue ends, is the most extraordinary of all; and his mode of 'forcing a balance' worthy of commendation to all cashiers in difficulties, and book-keepers about to devote themselves to *running account*. 'The cost of carrying coal by the latter' (the Canal) says he, 'allowing only two cents per ton per mile, would be one dollar.' Two cents per ton per mile! Why does not this elastic writer say at once 'only 4 or 6 cents per ton per mile?' He would thus avoid any possible collision of estimates from the flour-adventurers of the rail road; and still more, he would be out of need to rely for the result of his system upon the liberality or civism of a corporation, which has never shown any particular symptom of being exempt from the common accident of other creatures of the same kind, that of *having no soul*. How far there will be any 'reasonable' or 'moderate sacrifice of their peculiar interests' on the part of the rail road company (not to 'the present great public emergency' but to a *present small private interest*,) I have no occasion to enquire and do not trouble myself to conjecture.

I will only make a few remarks upon other parts of the suggestion.

1. Mr. R. C. Taylor, a sufficiently respectable authority, quotes the present price of transportation on the Lehigh and Schuylkill navigation at less than one cent per ton per mile. The actual cost to the contractor is less than $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per ton per mile. The toll on the Canal is $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per ton per mile. Cost by Canal, therefore, *one cent per ton per mile*. It would be well for 'Maryland' and the other zealous public instructors with whose lucubrations the American favors us, if they would *read* a little on this subject and some others kindred to it, before they *write*.

2. All 'the first named prices,' and the 'second' too, of the writer in the American may now be thrown overboard, and in the next calculation which he offers on this subject we pray him not to forget the cost of *loading and unloading and waste*; which he seems to lose sight of.

3. If the cost of rail road transportation of coal is so 'absolutely less' than canal transportation, why not bring the coal the whole way to Baltimore? There is no cross-cut wanting then.

4. The writer makes one admission, however, which redeems some of his casualties and mistakes; and which with all the writers on this subject, hitherto has seemed to form no article of creed, viz: that the city of Baltimore has 'her more predominant interest in the prosperity and solvency of the State.' The Canal friends want no other admission; but with this and the substitution by their antagonists of an appeal to facts, instead of their past 'short and easy method' of round assertion, they are sure of their victory.

5. The city of Baltimore does not happen to be 'the largest stockholder' in the

rail road: but even if she were so, 'Maryland's' readiness to make her sacrifice, what after all would be *a sacrifice to the State*, is quite superfluous. It is quite orthodox to make sacrifices to and on the rail road: but the Canal is a Pariah, whom no genuine Brahmin, like our worthy Bonze, can approach or speak kindly to.

6. Again I ask for a detailed estimate of rail road coal transportation. The public has been told for the last month a great deal about its comparative cheapness—about its substitution being 'certain,' 'expedient,' 'worthy of consideration,' 'to be inquired into,' until finally the force of truth or conscience has made it settle down into a 'moderate sacrifice.' Now how much is the sacrifice? Are the writers ashamed of their estimates? or have they really ever made any?

7. If the rail road, in addition to its other valuable characteristics, (which are as numerous as the articles contained in the box of Pandora if you believe its eager collaudators) is going to turn 'good Samaritan,' and carry coals out of charity and loving kindness, *for nothing*, I have no further remark to make, except that the period of such a metamorphosis will be also the epoch of the coal dealers finding cause to patronise it in this regard.

8. The Frostburg proprietors are too sagacious to be caught in the somewhat clumsy snare that Maryland has laid for them; and he can, therefore, take back his 'appeals to sectional jealousies,' and refit them against some future time when he may find equal pleasure in employing them, but not less 'perplexity,' I suspect, in their use.

EXTRA SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE.

At the session of the Legislature to be held on the 24th inst., matters of vital importance to Baltimore must be determined. Doubtless a direct tax will be laid, since without it the State must become bankrupt. Maryland will not lead in a course which will bring dishonor and ruin. In the mode of raising the direct tax Baltimore has a peculiar and strong interest. The city of Baltimore has already incurred a heavy and burthensome debt. The direct tax imposed to meet the interest on this debt, already amounts to 86 cents on the \$100, and probably will rise to one and one-eighth per cent. An individual who owns property to the amount of \$5,000 will seriously feel an annual tax of \$56.25. Our burthens in this city are already onerous, and if the Legislature in the system which it may adopt should endeavor to make the State tax light on the counties and severe on this city, a most serious blow will be struck at our prosperity, and property in Baltimore must inevitably depreciate greatly in value. The people of Baltimore will cheerfully pay their fair and just proportion of a direct tax to be laid by the State, and they will pay according to the real value of their property, but it will be asking too much of them in their present crippled and embarrassed condition to do more than this.

The condition of the city necessarily makes her people most sensitive on the subject of an increase of the State debt. We know that we cannot bear a heavier tax than must be imposed to make good the existing liabilities of the State and City.

We perceive that in order to meet debts already contracted by the State and City, we may be forced to pay a direct tax of from 1½ to 2 per cent. Can we bear more than this? Can a man who owns a house and lot worth \$5000, and which he can rent only for \$200 or \$250, pay more than \$100 in the shape of an annual tax? Real estate in Baltimore has not yielded for many years an average income exclusive of taxes of more than 5 per cent. If 2 per cent. be deducted

for taxes, the income will then be reduced to 3 per cent. With respect to debts already contracted, there is no remedy. They must be met.

Where is the man who can satisfy the people of Baltimore, that it is either proper or just to add to these liabilities? There is a point beyond which these things cannot be pressed. We have reached that point. We will no longer be deluded by estimates as to the cost of finishing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. We have been too often deceived to confide in them. We do not believe that two and a half millions of dollars will be sufficient to make this work productive. On the contrary, we are satisfied that when this amount shall have been expended, another claim founded on similar arguments will be made for another advance. We judge of the future by the past, and so judging we refuse any credence to these estimates. How can the State raise two and a half millions of dollars? Already the State has incurred a debt of upwards of \$15,000,000. The City of Baltimore owes upwards of \$5,000,000. The debts of both exceed \$20,000,000. Have we not gone far enough? Will the Legislature consent to receive 50 cents on the dollar on the State bonds? At this rate it will take, according to the estimate of the friends of the Canal, \$5,000,000 of State bonds to finish that work to Cumberland. And when the Canal is finished to Cumberland, whence, in these times of embarrassment and pressure, will be derived the capital required to operate on the coal regions, and to make the rail roads and canals necessary to connect the coal regions with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal? The same arguments now used to induce the State to proceed with the Canal to Cumberland, will be urged in favor of the State's completing the rail roads and canals to the coal regions, and it may be into turning the State into an immense coal digger and merchant. The property of the people of Baltimore may be sold to make productive the coal banks in Allegany, and unless we are true to our best interests and by our union and spirit we show that we are capable of protecting ourselves.

And we would ask what benefit will the people of Maryland, who do not own property on the borders of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, or coal banks, derive from the proposed increase of the State debt?—What advantage will Baltimore derive commensurate with the risk to be incurred? Where will be the gain to the Eastern Shore of Maryland? What peculiar benefit will the counties of Baltimore, Carroll, Harford, Anne Arundel and Calvert, gain from the increase of the State debt? The answer is obvious—none! Nay, Baltimore, it is conceded, will be positively injured. This Canal will take trade from her, and she will be compelled to pay an additional heavy tax to complete a work the only effect of which will be to divert trade and business from Baltimore to the District Cities. Our task-masters must believe that we have the patience of Job and the strength of Samson.

Let it not be understood that the writer of this would advocate the propriety of never completing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal to Cumberland. *This argument is directed against any increase of public liabilities at this time.* During the year 1842, the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road will be finished to Cumberland. When this is done, the speculators in the coal banks may show whether they possess the means of excavating the coal, making the necessary connections with Cumberland, and carrying the coal to market. This can be accomplished without any increase of the obligations of the State.

When a more propitious period shall have arrived, and when the credit of the State shall have been established upon a broad and permanent basis, the people of Baltimore will willingly unite in completing the Canal to Cumberland, and in making the cross-cut from the District to Baltimore. For the present, the State can provide sufficient means to prevent any injury to such parts of the Canal as

have been commenced. By doing this it will be shown that the policy of the State is not to abandon this work, but to avoid any increase of its liabilities in the present unsettled and difficult times.

Such a course as this will prove the prudence and sagacity of our rulers. Such a course as this will not deter those interested in the coal regions from opening the sources of immense wealth, which they calculate from them to derive. The rail road is being rapidly finished to Cumberland. It can be used as a feeder for a time at least. The capabilities of the coal region will be ascertained and developed, and when the time shall have arrived for the completion of the Canal with safety to the public interests, it may so soon as finished become productive.

The people of Baltimore can now meet in their wards, and make known their views to the Legislature. If our action is at all commensurate with the importance of the subject, we cannot fail to succeed in averting what would now be a heavy calamity—an increase of the public debt.

CIVIS.

DELTA, XII.

THE TRIUMVIRATE AND THE DICTATORSHIP.

THE Baltimore American of the 19th instant, contains among other things an article, signed Civis, and heralded by the special applause of the editors of the newspaper; which treats of the affairs of the Canal under title of the Extra Session of the Legislature. Whether this correspondent be really no other than our old acquaintance 'Maryland,' who has figured hitherto upon the same side of the amphitheatre, and now resorts to a device already practised successfully in the ancient strategies of making noises in various parts of the field to induce belief of numerous assailants, or whether he be a veritable new antagonist, I cannot pretend to determine. *Pater est quem nuptiae demonstrant*—the man is known when he is christened; and therefore believing 'Civis' to be a *tertium quid* or third person, I introduce him to the reading public of the SUN, along with the gallant cavalier, the 'Tax-payer,' and that grave sooth-sayer, 'Maryland,' as the would-be TRIUMVIRATE, whose effusions are to lay down the logic and prescribe the legislation of the State. Whether the DICTATORSHIP is to be assumed shortly by either of these is a matter which the Representatives of the State will determine.

I rather think that for this end a more artistical policy will have been requisite. All the apparatus of resolutions and ward-meetings, and calls to 'commensurate action,' which are incident upon or co-existent with the literary efforts of the correspondents in the American, are not the best contrivances for the object. The attempts to awe the Legislature, as if *Baltimore City were the whole State*, and the Baltimore and Ohio Rail Road with its million or more of shin-plasters, were the panacea for every sickness in the community, are not likely to succeed with an independent Assembly: and the invocations of 'union and spirit' and a 'show that we are capable of protecting ourselves'—appears equally premature and unpatriotic—will probably be followed by the habitual result of such incantations, in the spirits invoked refusing to obey those that call them. May it, for the good of the State, and the real, though unrecognised interest of the City of Baltimore, be so!

When positions of this kind are assumed, there is an end of all free discussion and argumentation, and I therefore take my leave of the subject for the present, with the distinct prophecy, that if the views advocated in the American are adopted by the Legislature, the Extra Session of 1841 will, within four years, be regarded as the most gloomy and evil epoch marked in the history of our State.







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 366 229 4